

Planning Committee

06 December 2024

Agenda item number 12

Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan – Agreeing to re-consult

Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary

The Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan has undergone an examination, and the Independent Examiner has published their report. The Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the Local Planning Authorities) and Carlton Colville Town Council propose to make modifications to the Neighbourhood Plan which differ from those recommended by the Examiner. The purpose of this consultation is to invite comments on the proposals to make modifications to the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan which differ from those recommended by the Examiner.

Recommendation

To endorse the proposed modifications to the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan that differ to those recommended by the Examiner. It is recommended that these are consulted on.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan has undergone an examination, and the Independent Examiner has published their report. The Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the Local Planning Authorities) and Carlton Colville Town Council propose to make modifications to the Neighbourhood Plan which differ from those recommended by the Examiner. The purpose of this consultation is to invite comments on the proposals to make modifications to the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan which differ from those recommended by the Examiner. Comments cannot be submitted in relation to modifications where the Local Planning Authorities agree with the Examiner.

2. Background

- 2.1. Carlton Colville Town Council submitted its Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents to the Local Planning Authorities in the spring of 2023. The Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan, evidence base and representations can be viewed [here](#).
- 2.2. The Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents were publicised between 10 May and 21 June 2023, ahead of the plan being examined. The Neighbourhood Plan was

examined by an independent Examiner: Nigel McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI. The Examiner issued his [report](#) on 15 January 2024.

- 2.3. In his report, the Examiner recommended a number of modifications to the Neighbourhood Plan which he deemed were necessary in order for the Plan to meet the 'Basic Conditions' and proceed to a referendum. The Local Planning Authorities and Town Council propose to take a different view on some of the recommendations made by the Examiner in his report and are putting forward different modifications to the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.4. The [Neighbourhood Planning legislation](#) states that following receipt of an Examiner's report, the Local Planning Authority(s) must consider each of the recommendations of the report (and the reasons for them) and decide what action to take in response to each recommendation. If a Local Planning Authority(s) propose to make a decision which differs from that recommended by the examiner, under certain circumstances the authority must notify prescribed persons of their proposed decision (and the reason for it) and invite representations. Furthermore, if the Local Planning Authority(s) consider it appropriate to do so, they may subsequently refer the matter to independent examination.
- 2.5. This document sets out which of the Examiner's recommendations the Local Planning Authorities and Town Council are proposing to disagree with and make an alternative modification, and the reasons. A draft of the relevant neighbourhood plan sections incorporating the alternative modifications proposed by the Local Planning Authorities and Town Council is also included. The table below shows all of the modifications proposed by the Examiner and the proposed responses from the Local Planning Authorities and Town Council.
- 2.6. Where the Local Planning Authorities and Town Council are in agreement with the Examiner's recommended modifications then these modifications are not open to consultation and comments will not be accepted in relation to these modifications.

3. The proposed alternative modifications

- 3.1. The table below contains the alternative modifications proposed by the Local Planning Authorities and Town Council that differ from those proposed by the independent Examiner. This document addresses *only* the Examiner's recommended modifications where the Local Planning Authorities disagree with them. The other modifications recommended by the Examiner are not disputed by the Local Planning Authorities and Town Council and do not form part of this consultation. For reference, they can be found in the Examiner's report on the East Suffolk Council [website](#).
- 3.2. The relevant paragraph number from the Examiner's report is provided in the first column. Where new text for the Neighbourhood Plan is proposed by the Local Authorities and Town Council this is shown as underlined. Where text is proposed to be

removed from the Neighbourhood Plan by the Local Planning Authorities this is shown as ~~struck through~~.

3.3. Please refer to the Examiner’s report to view the Examiner’s rationale in relation to each recommended modification.

Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ and Town Council’s Proposed Response
‘4 Design and Layout’	
<p>(Para. 74) 1. Policy CC1, delete part vii of the Policy:</p> <p><i>“vii. supporting and enabling walking and cycling by effectively integrating walking and cycling infrastructure (including public rights of way and Key Movement Routes as identified in Policy CC3) into development and ensuring that links into the wider network are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. Development must demonstrate how it has been informed by the Suffolk Design Streets Guide or any successor document.”</i></p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The whole of part A of the policy applies to development proposals ‘as appropriate to their scale, nature and location’ - therefore it does not need to be applied to all development and is not considered to be onerous. A minor change to the wording with respect to the application of the Suffolk Design Streets Guide will help to clarify this.</p> <p>It is unclear how paragraph 57 of the NPPF is relevant to this part of the policy.</p> <p>Policy CC3 is recommended to be amended therefore this reference should be removed.</p> <p>It is considered that amendment rather than deletion of this part of the policy is a more reasonable modification.</p> <p>Proposed alternative modification:</p> <p>Amend part vii to read:</p> <p><i>‘vii. supporting and enabling walking and cycling by effectively integrating walking and cycling infrastructure (including public rights of way) into development and ensuring that links into the wider network are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. <u>Where appropriate</u>, development must demonstrate how it has been informed by the Suffolk Design Streets Guide or any successor document.’</i></p>
<p>(Para. 74) 9. Delete Para 4.5 (which appears to suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan has a different role</p>	<p>Disagree.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' and Town Council's Proposed Response
<p>in respect of adopted allocations than is the case)</p>	<p>This paragraph correctly states that the neighbourhood plan will influence discussions with developers and the Local Planning Authority with respect to the site allocated by Local Plan policy WLP2.16. It also acknowledges that the final design will be subject to detailed plans. It is not agreed that this text provides an inaccurate indication of the role of the Neighbourhood Plan. Nonetheless, there is scope to add clarity with respect to the text being guidance only and also in relation to the role that masterplanning will play in delivering the allocated site, as required by adopted policy WLP2.16. Accordingly, it is recommended that some additional text is added to address this.</p> <p>Proposed alternative modification: Amend para. 4.5 to read:</p> <p><i><u>'The guidance contained in the Neighbourhood Plan is intended to should influence discussions with developers and East Suffolk Council, but the final layout, look and feel will be subject to a developer-led Masterplanning process which will be informed by detailed site appraisal and assessment and ongoing community engagement detailed plans. However, the Neighbourhood Plan has been informed by the aspirations and desires of our community to ensure that these are not over-looked and this presents an early insight into the challenges and opportunities for the future Masterplanning process.</u></i></p>
<p>(para. 74) 13. Delete Paras 4.15 to 4.21 inclusive. Delete Figure 4.12. (This section reads as though it comprises policy requirements, which is not the case)</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Use of supporting text to guide the application of the policies is supported. The supporting text is distinct from the policy text, which is contained within a green text box. Parts of paras 4.15 to 4.21 apply to parts of policy CC1 which are</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' and Town Council's Proposed Response
	<p>removed. Alternative supporting text is therefore set out below.</p> <p>Proposed alternative modification:</p> <p>Paras 4.15 to 4.21 inclusive to be deleted and new text to be added to form new para. 4.19 to read:</p> <p><u><i>'Open spaces provided as part of new developments should be connected to the wider town where possible using paths that encourage walking and cycling.'</i></u></p>
<p>(Para. 74) 15. Para 4.26, delete last two sentences (Any flood mitigation should have a natural character whilst recognising that it must fully be able to fulfil its primary function of flood mitigation. It should provide quieter spaces for relaxation and reflection as well as good pedestrian and cycling links through to the rest of the development and surrounding area.)</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The supporting text is distinct from the policy text, which is contained within a green text box. As such, the first sentence can be retained. Flood mitigation schemes which can provide pedestrian and cycle links plus quiet spaces are likely to be few, therefore this part of the text should be reworded so that this expectation does not need to be placed on all flood mitigation schemes.</p> <p>Proposed alternative modification:</p> <p>Retain penultimate sentence (Any flood mitigation...)</p> <p>Amend final sentence (It should provide quieter...) to read: <i>Where possible, it should provide quieter spaces for relaxation and reflection and good pedestrian and cycling links through to the rest of the development and surrounding area.</i></p>
<p>(Para. 74) 16. Delete Paras 4.27 to 4.29 inclusive. (These paras read as though they are policy requirements, which they are not. In making this recommendation, I note that the retained Para 4.30 largely</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>The supporting text is distinct from the policy text, which is contained within a green text box. The supporting text describes principles of good design which are applicable to major developments. There is no clear reason why</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' and Town Council's Proposed Response
summarises the intent of previous paragraphs)	<p>these cannot be included in the plan. A re-wording is recommended to clarify that the guidance applies to major residential developments (i.e. 10+ dwellings) which abut the countryside. Reference to pedestrian and cycle movement is included due to this principle being removed from the later 'Neighbourhood Edges' section of the plan.</p> <p>Proposed alternative modification:</p> <p>Delete paras 4.27 to 4.29 inclusive. Insert after para. 4.30: <i>Where major residential development abuts the countryside, the edges should have a soft appearance which can be supported through dwellings facing out to the countryside. Where possible, edge lanes should be incorporated which allow access to a small number of dwellings. Edge lanes should allow for pedestrian and cycle movement around the edge of the site where possible</i></p>
'5 Movement'	
(para. 96) 1. Delete title of Policy CC3 and replace with a new title: "Key Movement and Public Rights of Way"	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Changes to this section of the plan move the focus away from Key Movement routes and place the focus on walking, cycling and public rights of way. The title of the policy should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification:</p> <p>Delete title of Policy CC3 and replace with: <i>'Walking, Cycling, and Public Rights of Way'</i></p>
(para. 96) 2. Policy CC3: delete wording of Policy and replace with new wording: "The protection, enhancement and expansion of the public rights of way network, will be supported."	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as it stands there is some uncertainty over how parts of the policy which relate to the Key Movement Routes would be delivered. In this respect deletion of parts A, B and C is considered to be supportable. It is not agreed, however, that all parts of the policy</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' and Town Council's Proposed Response
	<p>should be wholly removed. Several parts of the policy embody what are considered to be sound planning objectives in terms of supporting active travel and good design, with no apparent barriers to practical delivery. With some modification it is considered that elements of the policy can be retained without conflict with the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification:</p> <p>Delete parts A and B and C.</p> <p>Modify part D as follows:</p> <p>D. Major development proposals must <u>should</u> ensure that pedestrian and cycle access into and through the site is safe, convenient and attractive. In particular, provision of segregated cycle and pedestrian routes will be strongly supported. Such routes that also ensure that access <u>Access to these routes by</u> for disabled users, the blind and deaf and users of mobility scooters is secured <u>should be provided where possible.</u></p> <p>Modify part E as follows:</p> <p>E. Where major development is adjacent to open countryside, layouts should provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of the development <u>where feasible</u> and, where possible, provide access for all non-vehicular users into the countryside, particularly where this provides connections with public rights of way and permissive footpaths.</p> <p>Delete F and replace with:</p> <p><u>The protection, enhancement and expansion of the public rights of way network, will be supported. Development which would result in the loss of existing PROWs will not be permitted unless alternative provision or diversions can be</u></p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' and Town Council's Proposed Response
	<p><u>arranged which are at least as attractive, safe and convenient for public use. This will apply to PROWs for pedestrian, cyclist, or horse rider use.</u></p>
<p>(para. 96) 3. Delete para. 5.3 to 5.12, inclusive</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Parts of these paragraphs provide helpful commentary around the plan preparation process and the community's wishes and aspirations. Some parts incorporate good planning and design principles. It is not considered to be reasonable or necessary to delete these parts. Other parts could be seen as superfluous and removal of these parts is agreed. The identified improvements in para. 5.9 are considered to be useful background information for the community, as such it is proposed that these are moved to an appendix for reference and addressed as non-planning actions. The maps provide useful context and should be retained. Adding public rights of way to the map in fig. 5.2 will improve the information available.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification:</p> <p>Delete paras 5.3 and 5.4.</p> <p>Para. 5.5: delete from first sentence: 'Whilst recognising these limits to what we can control and propose with regard to main routes'.</p> <p>Delete final sentence: 'The same principles will apply to the masterplanning of the other site allocations.'</p> <p>Add new sentence to end of para. 5.5: <u>'Furthermore, improvements to cycling and walking routes which were identified through the process of preparing the neighbourhood plan are included in Appendix B.'</u></p> <p>Para. 5.6: amend first sentence to say: 'Nevertheless, regardless of any particular</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' and Town Council's Proposed Response
	<p>considerations in respect of Bell Farm and Oakes Farm We do want to improve movement generally across our community <u>through:...</u></p> <p>Delete para. 5.7.</p> <p>Add Public Rights of Way to fig 5.2. Amend title of fig. 5.2 to 'Existing cycle-friendly routes and Public Rights of Way'.</p> <p>Delete heading 'Solutions'</p> <p>Delete paras. 5.8 and 5.9. Bullet pointed text from para. 5.9 to be moved to new 'Appendix B'.</p> <p>Amend para. 5.10 as follows:</p> <p>'Design of major development that incorporates 'neighbourhood edges' creates the opportunity to provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of developments. Not only will this help to provide a soft edge to development but it will provide attractive routes for non-vehicular movement and enable easy support access into the countryside through the network of public rights of way (which include bridleways) and permissive footpaths.'</p> <p>Delete para. 5.11</p> <p>Amend para. 5.12 as follows:</p> <p>'Alongside new cycling routes, the provision of suitable cycle parking at key destinations, e.g. shops, schools, workplaces, etc. is supported <u>encouraged</u>.'</p>
(Par. 96) 4. Delete Figure 5.3	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>This map is relevant to the aspirational routes which are proposed to be moved to new Appendix B. It is noted however that some of the routes on the map need clarifying.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' and Town Council's Proposed Response
	<p>Proposed Alternative Modification:</p> <p>Move figure 5.3 to new appendix B. Minor modifications to be made to the map to improve clarity as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer labelling of red routes • Clearer labelling of routes from the East Suffolk Council Cycling and Walking Strategy • Change Castleton Avenue route from red to orange • Remove route C5 as it is not necessary
'7 Community'	
(para. 133) 1. Delete policy CC8	<p>Disagree</p> <p>The Examiner states in para. 130 of his report that all of the detail relating to the country park will be determined via the planning application process, and that it is not role of the Neighbourhood Plan to determine details or set out development requirements to be addressed at the planning application stage. This statement is not supported and it is the LPAs view that neighbourhood plans can set out development requirements to be addressed at the planning application stage, provided it is done in a way that meets the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>The policy refers to fig. 7.1 which indicates uses for the country park which are considered to be both reasonable and deliverable. Flexibility around how these are applied at the planning application stage will be required, but there is no clear reason why they cannot form the basis to inform the country park masterplan.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification:</p> <p>Re-word policy CC8 as follows:</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' and Town Council's Proposed Response
	<p><i>Proposals to deliver the Carlton Colville Country Park (required as part of the development of land at Bell Farm, as allocated in Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy WLP2.16) is expected to be informed by <u>should demonstrate how the principles shown in Figure 7.1 have informed the development of the masterplan.</u> Provision is encouraged to be made for the range of activities shown.</i></p>
<p>(Para. 133) 2. Para 7.17, change opening paragraph to <i>“This provides an opportunity to create a successful country park for the benefit of the local community and visitors. To help achieve this, the Town Council has worked to produce a framework and a suggested outline plan for the country park, set out below. Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan cannot control the delivery of the country park, the Town Council is keen to work with the applicant to ensure the country park’s long-term sustainability. The purpose of the framework and plan below is to help achieve this.”</i></p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Para. 7.17 contains useful supporting information to help the application of the policy.</p> <p>Proposed Action:</p> <p>Retain para. 7.17</p>
<p>(Para. 133) 3. Add new title above Nos 1-14 in list: “Country Park – Suggested Framework”</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>It is proposed to retain para 7.17 and a modified Policy CC8, therefore this new title is not needed</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification:</p> <p>Do not add new title.</p>
<p>(Para. 133) 4. Add new sentence below title: “The following are suggestions only and the Town Council will seek to engage with the applicant to develop these ideas further.”</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>It is proposed to retain the policy, therefore this modification is not needed.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification:</p> <p>Do not add the new sentence.</p>
<p>(Para. 133) 6. Delete Para 7.18</p>	<p>Disagree</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' and Town Council's Proposed Response
	<p>It is a reasonable and relevant objective to put in place a management plan for the country park. However, the wording of this paragraph does not reflect the planning policy requirements in this respect. This paragraph should be re-worded to reflect the more aspirational nature of this objective.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification:</p> <p>Re-word para. 7.18 to read: <i>The Country Park will need to be supplemented by a full <u>Development proposals are encouraged to include provision for a comprehensive management plan for the country park once final layout/area are agreed as part of any development proposals.</u></i></p>
<p>Additional Modifications</p>	
<p>The Examiner's report references in several places that the supporting text is written in a way so that it appears to be a planning policy requirement. This view is not shared by the Local Planning Authorities and Town Council - the supporting text is clearly distinct from the planning policy text, which is contained within a green box, and gives guidance on applying the policies in the plan. In order to provide additional clarity over this matter, the additional modification below is proposed.</p> <p>Proposed Modification:</p> <p>Add sentence at end of para. 1.3: 'The supporting text in the plan is intended to support the implementation of the policies and should not be applied as policy.'</p>	

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 15 November 2024

Appendix 1 – [Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan – Additional Focused Consultation](#)

Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan – Additional Focused Consultation

Consultation on proposals to make modifications to the Neighbourhood Plan which differ from those recommended by the Independent Examiner

11th December 2024 to 5th February 2025



Contents

Introduction	3
Background	3
Consultation Period	4
Consultation Responses.....	4
Proposed Alternative Modifications.....	5
Draft text of sections including Alternative Modifications.....	19
Introduction	19
4. DESIGN AND LAYOUT	19
5. MOVEMENT	25
Carlton Colville Country Park	27
APPENDIX B.....	29

Introduction

The Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan has undergone an examination and the Independent Examiner has published their report. The Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the Local Planning Authorities) propose to make modifications to the Neighbourhood Plan which differ from those recommended by the Examiner. The purpose of this consultation is to invite comments on the Local Planning Authorities' proposals to make modifications to the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan which differ from those recommended by the Examiner. Comments cannot be submitted in relation to modifications where the Local Planning Authorities are in agreement with the Examiner.

Background

Carlton Colville Town Council submitted their Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents to the Local Planning Authorities in the spring of 2023. The Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan, evidence base and representations can be viewed at:

www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-plans-in-the-area/carlton-colville-neighbourhood-plan/

The Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents were publicised between 10th May and 21st June 2023, ahead of the plan being examined. The Neighbourhood Plan was examined by an Independent Examiner: Nigel McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI. The Examiner issued his report on 15th January 2024, and this can be viewed at

www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Neighbourhood-Planning/Designated-Neighbourhood-Areas/Carlton-Colville/Carlton-Colville-Examiners-Report-15th-Jan-2024.pdf.

In his report, the Examiner recommended a number of modifications to the neighbourhood plan which he deemed were necessary in order for the plan to meet the 'Basic Conditions' and proceed to a referendum. The Local Planning Authorities propose to take a different view on some of the recommendations made by the Examiner in his report and are putting forward different modifications to the neighbourhood plan.

The Neighbourhood Planning legislation (www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/schedule/4B) states that following receipt of an Examiner's report, the Local Planning Authority(s) must consider each of the recommendations of the report (and the reasons for

them) and decide what action to take in response to each recommendation. If the Local Planning Authority(s) propose to make a decision which differs from that recommended by the examiner, under certain circumstances the authority must notify prescribed persons of their proposed decision (and the reason for it) and invite representations. Furthermore, if the Local Planning Authority(s) consider it appropriate to do so, they may subsequently refer the matter to independent examination.

This document sets out which of the Examiner’s recommendations the Local Planning Authorities are proposing to disagree with and make an alternative modification, and the reasons why. A draft of the relevant neighbourhood plan sections incorporating the alternative modifications proposed by the Local Planning Authorities is also included. The table below shows all of the modifications proposed by the Examiner and the proposed responses from the Local Planning Authorities.

Where the Local Planning Authorities are in agreement with the Examiner’s recommended modifications then these modifications are not open to consultation and comments will not be accepted in relation to these modifications.

Consultation Period

Comments on the Local Planning Authorities’ proposals to disagree with the examiner and make alternative modifications are invited between 11th December 2024 and 5th February 2025. Visit the consultation portal to find out more and make a representation.

Consultation Responses

Consultation responses must be received by East Suffolk Council by 5pm Wednesday 5th February 2025. Comments can be submitted using the following methods:

- Online – *(link to consultation portal to be added when generated)*
- By email to – PlanningPolicy@eastsoffolk.gov.uk
- By post to – Planning Policy and Delivery Team Riverside 4 Canning Road Lowestoft NR33 0EQ

Should you have any queries please contact the Planning Policy and Delivery Team on 01394 444557 or email planningpolicy@eastsuffolk.gov.uk.

Proposed Alternative Modifications

The table below contains the alternative modifications proposed by the local planning authorities that differ from those proposed by the Independent Examiner. This document addresses *only* the Examiner’s recommended modifications where the Local Planning Authorities disagree with them. The other modifications recommended by the Examiner are not disputed by the Local Planning Authorities and **do not form part of this consultation**. For reference, they can be found in the Examiner’s report on the East Suffolk Council website: www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning.

The relevant paragraph number from the Examiner’s report is provided in the first column. Where new text for the Neighbourhood Plan is proposed by the Local Authorities this is shown as underlined. Where text is proposed to be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan by the Local Planning Authorities this is shown as struck-through.

Please refer to the Examiner’s report to view the Examiner’s rationale in relation to each recommended modifications.

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
	‘4 Design and Layout’	
Proposed Alternative Modification 1	(Para. 74) 1. Policy CC1, delete part vii of the Policy: <i>“vii. supporting and enabling walking and cycling by effectively integrating walking and cycling infrastructure (including public rights of way and Key</i>	Disagree. The whole of part A of the policy applies to development proposals ‘as appropriate to their scale, nature and location’ - therefore it does not need to be applied to all development and is not considered to be

Reference	Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' Proposed Response
	<p><i>Movement Routes as identified in Policy CC3) into development and ensuring that links into the wider network are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. Development must demonstrate how it has been informed by the Suffolk Design Streets Guide or any successor document."</i></p>	<p>onerous. A minor change to the wording with respect to the application of the Suffolk Design Streets Guide will help to clarify this.</p> <p>It is unclear how paragraph 57 of the NPPF is relevant to this part of the policy.</p> <p>Policy CC3 is recommended to be amended therefore this reference should be removed.</p> <p>It is considered that amendment rather than deletion of this part of the policy is a more reasonable modification.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 1:</p> <p>Amend part vii to read:</p> <p><i>'vii. supporting and enabling walking and cycling by effectively integrating walking and cycling infrastructure (including public rights of way) into development and ensuring that links into the wider network are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. <u>Where appropriate</u>, development must demonstrate how it has been informed by the Suffolk Design Streets Guide or any successor document.'</i></p>
<p>Proposed Alternative Modification 2</p>	<p>(Para. 74) 9. Delete Para 4.5 (which appears to suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan has a different role</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>This paragraph correctly states that the neighbourhood plan will influence discussions with developers and the Local Planning Authority with respect to the site allocated by Local Plan policy</p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
	in respect of adopted allocations than is the case)	<p>WLP2.16. It also acknowledges that the final design will be subject to detailed plans. It is not agreed that this text provides an inaccurate indication of the role of the Neighbourhood Plan. Nonetheless, there is scope to add clarity with respect to the text being guidance only and also in relation to the role that masterplanning will play in delivering the allocated site, as required by adopted policy WLP2.16. Accordingly, it is recommended that some additional text is added to address this.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 2: Amend para. 4.5 to read:</p> <p><i><u>‘The guidance contained in the Neighbourhood Plan is intended to should influence discussions with developers and East Suffolk Council, but the final layout, look and feel will be subject to a developer-led Masterplanning process which will be informed by detailed site appraisal and assessment and ongoing community engagement detailed plans. However, the Neighbourhood Plan has been informed by the aspirations and desires of our community to ensure that these are not over-looked and this presents an early insight into the challenges and opportunities for the future Masterplanning process.</u></i></p>
Proposed Alternative	(para. 74) 13. Delete Paras 4.15 to 4.21 inclusive. Delete Figure 4.12. (This section reads as though it comprises	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Use of supporting text to guide the application of the policies is supported. The supporting text is distinct from the policy text, which</p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
Modification 3	policy requirements, which is not the case)	<p>is contained within a green text box. Parts of paras 4.15 to 4.21 apply to parts of policy CC1 which are removed. Alternative supporting text is therefore set out below.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 3:</p> <p>Para’s 4.15 to 4.21 inclusive to be deleted and new text to be added to form new para. 4.19 to read:</p> <p><u><i>‘Open spaces provided as part of new developments should be connected to the wider town where possible using paths that encourage walking and cycling.’</i></u></p>
Proposed Alternative Modification 4	(Para. 74) 15. Para 4.26, delete last two sentences (Any flood mitigation should have a natural character whilst recognising that it must fully be able to fulfil its primary function of flood mitigation. It should provide quieter spaces for relaxation and reflection as well as good pedestrian and cycling links through to the rest of the development and surrounding area.)	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The supporting text is distinct from the policy text, which is contained within a green text box. As such, the first sentence can be retained. Flood mitigation schemes which can provide pedestrian and cycle links plus quiet spaces are likely to be few, therefore this part of the text should be reworded so that this expectation does not need to be placed on all flood mitigation schemes.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 4:</p> <p>Retain penultimate sentence (Any flood mitigation...)</p> <p>Amend final sentence (It should provide quieter...) to read: <u><i>Where possible, it should provide quieter spaces for relaxation and reflection</i></u></p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
		<i>and good pedestrian and cycling links through to the rest of the development and surrounding area.</i>
Proposed Alternative Modification 5	(Para. 74) 16. Delete Paras 4.27 to 4.29 inclusive. (These paras read as though they are policy requirements, which they are not. In making this recommendation, I note that the retained Para 4.30 largely summarises the intent of previous paragraphs)	<p>Disagree</p> <p>The supporting text is distinct from the policy text, which is contained within a green text box. The supporting text describes principles of good design which are applicable to major developments. There is no clear reason why these cannot be included in the plan. A re-wording is recommended to clarify that the guidance applies to major residential developments (ie. 10+ dwellings) which abut the countryside. Reference to pedestrian and cycle movement is included due to this principle being removed from the later ‘Neighbourhood Edges’ section of the plan.</p> <p>Proposed alternative modification 5:</p> <p>Delete para.s 4.27 to 4.29 inclusive. Insert after para. 4.30: <i>Where major residential development abuts the countryside, the edges should have a soft appearance which can be supported through dwellings facing out to the countryside. Where possible, edge lanes should be incorporated which allow access to a small number of dwellings. Edge lanes should allow for pedestrian and cycle movement around the edge of the site where possible</i></p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
	‘5 Movement’	
Proposed Alternative Modification 6	(para. 96) 1. Delete title of Policy CC3 and replace with a new title: “Key Movement and Public Rights of Way”	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Changes to this section of the plan move the focus away from Key Movement routes and place the focus on walking, cycling and public rights of way. The title of the policy should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 6:</p> <p>Delete title of Policy CC3 and replace with: <i>‘Walking, Cycling, and Public Rights of Way’</i></p>
Proposed Alternative Modification 7	(para. 96) 2. Policy CC3: delete wording of Policy and replace with new wording: “The protection, enhancement and expansion of the public rights of way network, will be supported.”	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as it stands there is some uncertainty over how parts of the policy which relate to the Key Movement Routes would be delivered. In this respect deletion of parts A, B and C is considered to be supportable. It is not agreed, however, that all parts of the policy should be wholly removed. Several parts of the policy embody what are considered to be sound planning objectives in terms of supporting active travel and good design, with no apparent barriers to practical delivery. With some modification it is considered</p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
		<p>that elements of the policy can be retained without conflict with the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 7:</p> <p>Delete parts A and B and C.</p> <p>Modify part D as follows:</p> <p>D. Major development proposals must <u>should</u> ensure that pedestrian and cycle access into and through the site is safe, convenient and attractive. In particular, provision of segregated cycle and pedestrian routes will be strongly supported. Such routes that also ensure that access <u>Access</u> to these routes by <u>for</u> disabled users, the blind and deaf and users of mobility scooters is secured <u>should be provided where possible</u>.</p> <p>Modify part E as follows:</p> <p>E. Where major development is adjacent to open countryside, layouts should provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of the development <u>where feasible</u> and, where possible, provide access for all non-vehicular users into the countryside, particularly where this provides connections with public rights of way and permissive footpaths.</p> <p>Delete F and replace with:</p>

Reference	Examiner's Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities' Proposed Response
		<p><u>The protection, enhancement and expansion of the public rights of way network, will be supported. Development which would result in the loss of existing PROWs will not be permitted unless alternative provision or diversions can be arranged which are at least as attractive, safe and convenient for public use. This will apply to PROWs for pedestrian, cyclist, or horse rider use.</u></p>
Proposed Alternative Modification 8	(para. 96) 3. Delete para. 5.3 to 5.12, inclusive	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Parts of these paragraphs provide helpful commentary around the plan preparation process and the community's wishes and aspirations. Some parts incorporate good planning and design principles. It is not considered to be reasonable or necessary to delete these parts. Other parts could be seen as superfluous and removal of these parts is agreed. The identified improvements in para. 5.9 are considered to be useful background information for the community, as such it is proposed that these are moved to an appendix for reference and addressed as non-planning actions. The maps provide useful context and should be retained. Adding public rights of way to the map in fig. 5.2 will improve the information available.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 8:</p> <p>Delete para.s 5.3 and 5.4.</p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
		<p>Para. 5.5: delete from first sentence: ‘Whilst recognising these limits to what we can control and propose with regard to main routes’.</p> <p>Delete final sentence: ‘The same principles will apply to the masterplanning of the other site allocations.’</p> <p>Add new sentence to end of para. 5.5: <u>‘Furthermore, improvements to cycling and walking routes which were identified through the process of preparing the neighbourhood plan are included in Appendix B.’</u></p> <p>Para. 5.6: amend first sentence to say: ‘Nevertheless, regardless of any particular considerations in respect of Bell Farm and Oakes Farm We do want to improve movement generally across our community <u>through:…’</u></p> <p>Delete para. 5.7.</p> <p>Add Public Rights of Way to fig 5.2. Amend title of fig. 5.2 to ‘Existing cycle-friendly routes and Public Rights of Way’.</p> <p>Delete heading ‘Solutions’</p> <p>Delete paras. 5.8 and 5.9. Bullet pointed text from para. 5.9 to be moved to new ‘Appendix B’.</p> <p>Amend para. 5.10 as follows:</p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
		<p>‘Design of major development that incorporates ‘neighbourhood edges’ creates the opportunity to provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of developments. Not only will this help to provide a soft edge to development but it will provide attractive routes for non-vehicular movement and enable easy support access into the countryside through the network of public rights of way (which include bridleways) and permissive footpaths.’</p> <p>Delete para. 5.11</p> <p>Amend para. 5.12 as follows:</p> <p>‘Alongside new cycling routes, the provision of suitable cycle parking at key destinations, e.g. shops, schools, workplaces, etc. is supported <u>encouraged</u>.’</p>
<p>Proposed Alternative Modification 9</p>	<p>(Par. 96) 4. Delete Figure 5.3</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>This map is relevant to the aspirational routes which are proposed to be moved to new Appendix B. It is noted however that some of the routes on the map need clarifying.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 9:</p> <p>Move figure 5.3 to new appendix B. Minor modifications to be made to the map to improve clarity as follows:</p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer labelling of red routes • Clearer labelling of routes from the East Suffolk Council Cycling and Walking Strategy • Change Castleton Avenue route from red to orange • Remove route C5 as it is not necessary
	‘7 Community’	
Proposed Alternative Modification 10	(para. 133) 1. Delete policy CC8	<p>Disagree</p> <p>The Examiner states in para. 130 of his report that all of the detail relating to the country park will be determined via the planning application process, and that it is not role of the Neighbourhood Plan to determine details or set out development requirements to be addressed at the planning application stage. This statement is not supported and it is the LPAs view that neighbourhood plans can set out development requirements to be addressed at the planning application stage, provided it is done in a way that meets the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>The policy refers to fig. 7.1 which indicates uses for the country park which are considered to be both reasonable and deliverable. Flexibility around how these are applied at the planning application stage will be required, but there is no clear reason why they cannot form the basis to inform the country park masterplan.</p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
		<p>Proposed Alternative Modification 10:</p> <p>Re-word policy CC8 as follows:</p> <p><i>Proposals to deliver the Carlton Colville Country Park (required as part of the development of land at Bell Farm, as allocated in Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy WLP2.16) is expected to be informed by <u>should demonstrate how the principles shown in Figure 7.1 have informed the development of the masterplan</u>. Provision is encouraged to be made for the range of activities shown.</i></p>
<p>Proposed Alternative Modification 11</p>	<p>(Para. 133) 2. Para 7.17, change opening paragraph to <i>“This provides an opportunity to create a successful country park for the benefit of the local community and visitors. To help achieve this, the Town Council has worked to produce a framework and a suggested outline plan for the country park, set out below. Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan cannot control the delivery of the country park, the Town Council is keen to work with the applicant to ensure the country park’s long-term sustainability.</i></p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Para. 7.17 contains useful supporting information to help the application of the policy.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 11:</p> <p>Retain para. 7.17</p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
	<i>The purpose of the framework and plan below is to help achieve this.”</i>	
Proposed Alternative Modification 12	(Para. 133) 3. Add new title above Nos 1-14 in list: “Country Park – Suggested Framework”	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>It is proposed to retain para 7.17 and a modified Policy CC8, therefore this new title is not needed</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 12:</p> <p>Do not add new title.</p>
Proposed Alternative Modification 13	(Para. 133) 4. Add new sentence below title: “The following are suggestions only and the Town Council will seek to engage with the applicant to develop these ideas further.”	<p>Disagree</p> <p>It is proposed to retain the policy, therefore this modification is not needed.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 13:</p> <p>Do not add the new sentence.</p>
Proposed Alternative Modification 14	(Para. 133) 6. Delete Para 7.18	<p>Disagree</p> <p>It is a reasonable and relevant objective to put in place a management plan for the country park. However, the wording of this paragraph does not reflect the planning policy requirements in this respect. This paragraph should be re-worded to reflect the more aspirational nature of this objective.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Modification 14:</p>

Reference	Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Local Planning Authorities’ Proposed Response
		<p>Re-word para. 7.18 to read: <i>The Country Park will need to be supplemented by a full <u>Development proposals are encouraged to include provision for a comprehensive management plan for the country park once final layout/area are agreed as part of any development proposals.</u></i></p>
	<p>Additional Modifications</p>	
<p>Proposed Additional Modification 1</p>	<p>The Examiner’s report references in several places that the supporting text is written in a way so that it appears to be a planning policy requirement. This view is not shared by the Local Planning Authorities - the supporting text is clearly distinct from the planning policy text, which is contained within a green box, and gives guidance on applying the policies in the plan. In order to provide additional clarity over this matter, the additional modification below is proposed.</p> <p>Proposed Additional Modification 1:</p> <p>Add sentence at end of para. 1.3: ‘The supporting text in the plan is intended to support the implementation of the policies and should not be applied as policy.’</p>	

Draft text of sections including Alternative Modifications

To help illustrate the alternative modifications proposed by the Local Planning Authorities, the relevant sections of the Neighbourhood Plan have been drafted below to include the modifications as proposed by the Local Planning Authorities. These sections also incorporate the Examiner’s modifications which the Local Planning Authorities are in agreement with, so that the sections can be read with all proposed modifications together. As stated in the Introduction, comments cannot be submitted in relation to modifications where the Local Planning Authorities are in agreement with the Examiner. Paragraph numbers and bullet points have been amended to fit the updated ordering.

Introduction

- 1.3 Some of the Neighbourhood Plan policies are general and apply throughout the Plan area, whilst others are site or area-specific and apply only to the appropriate areas illustrated on the relevant map. Nevertheless, in considering proposals for development, East Suffolk Council and the Broads Authority will apply all relevant policies of the Plan. It is therefore assumed that the Plan will be read as a whole, although some cross-referencing between Plan policies has been provided. The supporting text in the plan is intended to support the implementation of the policies and should not be applied as policy.

4. DESIGN AND LAYOUT

Introduction and background

- 4.1 As the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 126) notes, ‘good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities’. Research, such as for the Government’s Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, now part of the Design Council) has shown that good design of buildings and places can:
- Improve health and well-being;

- Increase civic pride and cultural activity;
- Reduce crime and anti-social behaviour; and
- Reduce pollution.

4.2 Development of Carlton Colville has been substantial over the last 40 years, growing from a rural village separated from Lowestoft and its suburbs to one where it is now seen a part of the Lowestoft area. There have been a number of large-scale developments that have created the feeling of just being ‘dropped’ onto our community. Large scale development of several hundred houses by different developers over the years have served to diminish the sense of cohesiveness and distinctiveness. It is really important that new development, particularly where it is large scale, is designed so that it is part of Carlton Colville and feels and looks like it is part of the community.

Land South of The Street (Bell Farm development)

- 4.3 As the single largest development that is likely to affect the community during the plan period, we have spent a lot of time focusing on how the Neighbourhood Plan can help to support the creation of a cohesive, attractive part of the Plan Area through its design and layout.
- 4.4 The site provides many opportunities to utilise the existing landscape in order to create a sympathetic character-led development response. The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan (shown at Figure 1.1 in this plan) establishes these, including locating the country park in the west to allow the existing water runoff pattern to be preserved, thus retaining the scheduled monument’s seasonal wet characteristic. In addition, green areas can be introduced to act as flood mitigation where the flood risk is high. There is an opportunity to link these green spaces to the country park to form a network. This can be enhanced by retaining the existing hedgerows which can connect with the green space via foot and cycle paths.
- 4.5 The guidance contained in the Neighbourhood Plan is intended to influence discussions with developers and East Suffolk Council, but the final layout, look and feel will be subject to a developer-led Masterplanning process which will be informed by detailed site appraisal and assessment and ongoing community engagement. However, the Neighbourhood Plan has been informed by the aspirations and desires of our community to ensure that these are not over-looked and this presents an early insight into the challenges and opportunities for the future Masterplanning process.

- 4.6 The following sections provide guidance about high quality design. Unless otherwise stated, this applies to all development across the neighbourhood area, excluding the Broads Authority Executive Area.

Key guiding principles

Character – design and materials

- 4.7 We feel new developments should have a feel derived from existing natural and historic site features. For example, the steeper pitch of roof, the use of brick, flint and render or on occasion, appropriate (pastel) colour. The required essential design ethos will be that of a 21st century design that links visually with the best aspects of the existing ‘old village’ area of Carlton Colville and with a strong emphasis on greening and contact with nature.
- 4.8 The housing at the edge of a development should use a variety of materials, non-uniform massing and a mixture of gables and ridges in order to create an interesting view looking towards the development from outside.

[Figures 4.1 – 4.6 retained.]

- 4.9 The character of any new developments should be shaped by their context. By this we mean their scale and orientation should be sympathetic to their urban/suburban environment or should be positioned appropriately in their rural setting. Specific views that should be considered are identified separately in Policy CC2.

[Figure 4.7 Layout should preserve and enhance existing natural features]

- 4.10 There is a good mix of building types in the community which can be used to help integrate development with the rest of the village. For example, the buildings adjacent to the Bell Farm development site do not exceed two storeys, therefore the edge of the development should respect the existing building height, tapering off in height as they meet the open countryside. Another example of this using the Bell Farm development topography is shown in Figure 4.8 below.

Topography

- 4.11 A particularly important consideration in the largely flat topography of the area is Bloodmoor Hill which provides a unique, unspoilt panorama of open countryside (this is the orange area in the east of the site shown in Figure 4.8). From the high point there is a

visual link between the ancient site at Bloodmoor Hill (in Carlton Colville) and Gisleham (particularly the Grade I Church) and the old village of Carlton Colville. It will be important that development of the Bell Farm site addresses this in its design and layout as Bloodmoor Hill and its views will become publicly accessible. These views are addressed in Policy CC2.

[Figure 4.8 Map showing topography and drainage ditches]

- 4.12 The Bell Farm site is largely flat; however, the orange areas in Figure 4.8 represent higher ground within the site. The change in level to the south of the site could be strategically utilised to reduce the impact of development to the church views and the scheduled monument. There are drainage ditches and areas where surface water collects which may affect where development is located. The water floods from the south to the north, i.e. towards the village.

Heritage

- 4.13 Both the Bell Farm and Oakes Farm sites have been identified as likely to have a number of areas of archaeological interest as they adjoin known and recorded early settlements. In the case of Bell Farm, the key heritage consideration relates to the potential impact of development on the Scheduled Monument, which is described as a moated area 200m south west of Bell Farm. To reduce harm to the moated area, it is recommended that the west of the site should retain its rural setting by surrounding the monument with a country park (as stated in the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan). This would also preserve the views to the Grade I listed Holy Trinity Church, as identified above. The Heritage Impact Assessment appended to the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan also recommends that the access road closest to the Monument should be re-considered because of its negative visual impact.
- 4.14 Systematic archaeological evaluation is required across the Bell Farm and Oakes Farm sites prior to the submission of planning applications so that remains across the sites can be understood and factored into development, along with any necessary mitigation.

Shared spaces

- 4.15 The scale of the Bell Farm development and the illustrative masterplan suggest that there will be a number of opportunities for shared spaces scattered around the site. Spaces such as these can be added to development in order to provide visual interest, create public space or even act as a traffic calming measure. The location and appearance of the shared spaces can differ depending on their purpose.

- 4.16 For example, using a different surface material at a junction can act as a traffic calming measure as well as providing visual interest by breaking up long straight roads. This can also help with way finding. Additional greenery can enhance the attractiveness of the space and provide character.

[Figure 4.13 Shared surface junctions]

- 4.17 Small public spaces can be created on residential streets to the side of the road by pushing back some of the houses and organising them around the public space to ensure it is well overlooked. These spaces can provide places to sit and offer a place to relax within the neighbourhood.

[Figure 4.14 Shared surface public spaces]

Layout

- 4.18 For large scale developments such as the 900-home Bell Farm allocation or potentially the Oakes Farm sports development area, it will generally be the case that the central area will have the highest levels of activity. In these areas, there is the opportunity for the building density to be higher and the streets to provide a good sense of enclosure. Any flood mitigation should have a natural character whilst recognising that it must fully be able to fulfil its primary function of flood mitigation. Where possible, it should provide quieter spaces for relaxation and reflection and good pedestrian and cycling links to the surrounding area.

[Figure 4.15 Combination of natural features, structures and space to create an open feel]

- 4.19 Open spaces provided as part of new developments should be connected to the wider town where possible using paths that encourage walking and cycling.
- 4.20 In general terms, densities will be required to reflect Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy WLP8.32 and will be highest around development centres, reducing towards the settlement margins. Where major residential development abuts the countryside, the edges should have a soft appearance which can be supported through dwellings facing out to the countryside. Where possible, edge lanes should be incorporated which allow access to a small number of dwellings. Edge lanes should allow for pedestrian and cycle movement around the edge of the site where possible.

- 4.21 Specifically relating to the Bell Farm development, there is an existing foot and cycle path that is adjacent to the edge of the site and leads to the Dales housing estate. This path has the potential to link pedestrians and cyclists from the existing estate to the new development.

[Figure 4.17 Foot and cycle path access to Bell Farm]

- 4.22 Development should take account of the Suffolk Design Streets Guide which provides clear advice on different types of road layout for different types of streets and developments. Most importantly it recognises the need for different types of movement ‘frameworks’ for different types of user, i.e. pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users, specialist service vehicles and private cars.

Policy CC1: High Quality Design

- A. Across the whole Neighbourhood Area, development proposals (as appropriate to their scale, nature and location) should demonstrate high quality design and layout which respects the local character of Carlton Colville. In particular this means:**
- i. demonstrating a distinct character derived from existing natural and historic site features;**
 - ii. being informed by the surrounding landscape and features of interest, including panoramic views from the high ground at Bloodmoor Hill;**
 - iii. respecting prevailing building heights and ensuring heights taper off at the edges of sites where they meet open countryside;**
 - iv. softening the appearance of buildings on the edge of a development where it meets the open countryside through the use of natural materials and features such as green roofs;**
 - v. minimising light pollution to ensure that it does not have a detrimental effect on residential amenity or nature or the intrinsically dark skies of the Broads;**
 - vi. supporting and enabling walking and cycling by effectively integrating walking and cycling infrastructure (including public rights of way) into development and ensuring that links into the wider network are maintained and, where**

possible, enhanced. Where appropriate, development must demonstrate how it has been informed by the Suffolk Design Streets Guide or any successor document.

- B. All new development should demonstrate high quality design and is required to respect its surroundings. The following will be supported:**
- i. Use of a variety of brick, flint and render finishes along with roof styles that visually link development with the best aspects of the existing 'old village' area.**
 - ii. Development is set back from roads and boundary treatments are at a low level, creating an open feel.**
 - iii. Landscaping, including boundary treatments such as hedges as well as street trees, shall be used to ensure development does not create a hard edge.**

5. MOVEMENT

- 5.1 One of the main concerns of existing residents when new developments are being considered is the impact of traffic. Figure 5.1 below identifies the most important routes into/out of our community and the key destinations.
- 5.2 We recognise that the largest developments in our Neighbourhood Area over the next 15 years are likely to be the Bell Farm, Oakes Farm and South Lowestoft Industrial Estate site allocations.
- 5.3 The community has expressed views through the Neighbourhood Plan process about possible layouts and routes within the proposed Bell Farm site in particular to try and minimise impact on the existing community and historical assets whilst also making movement easier for new residents, the school and the retirement facility. These will be fed into the joint masterplanning process. Furthermore, improvements to cycling and walking routes which were identified through the process of preparing the neighbourhood plan are included in Appendix B.
- 5.4 We want to improve movement generally across our community through:
- linking existing and proposed residential and recreational areas with employment and services (for example to the principle major retail and local industries at the South Lowestoft Industrial Estate);

- where possible having development concentrated within walking distance of facilities; and
- providing improved cycling and pedestrian facilities as well as improving access and maximising safe movement. In this regard, there are number of schemes identified in the East Suffolk Cycling and Walking Strategy which should form a core part of this.

5.5 Design of major development that incorporates ‘neighbourhood edges’ creates the opportunity to provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of developments. Not only will this help to provide a soft edge to development but it will provide attractive routes for non-vehicular movement and support access into the countryside through the network of public rights of way (which include bridleways) and permissive footpaths.

5.6 Alongside new cycling routes, the provision of suitable cycle parking at key destinations, e.g. shops, schools, workplaces, etc, is encouraged.

[Figure 5.2 Existing cycle-friendly routes and Public Rights of Way

Public rights of way

5.7 Public rights of way (PROWs) are an important means of access into the countryside for a range of users (see Figure 2.3). Suffolk has a very extensive network of PROWs and it is important that development plans protect and, where possible, enhance these. Suffolk County Council has a Green Access Strategy⁵ which sets out a commitment to enhance PROWs, including new linkages and upgrading routes where there is a need. The strategy also seeks to improve access for all and to support healthy and sustainable access between communities and services through development funding and partnership working.

Policy CC3: Walking, Cycling and Public Rights of Way

A. Major development proposals should ensure that pedestrian and cycle access into and through the site is safe, convenient and attractive. In particular, provision of segregated cycle and pedestrian routes will be strongly supported. Access to these routes for disabled users, the blind and deaf and users of mobility scooters should be provided where possible.

B. Where major development is adjacent to open countryside, layouts should provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of the development where feasible and, where possible, provide access for all non-vehicular users into the countryside, particularly where this provides connections with public rights of way and permissive footpaths.

C. The protection, enhancement and expansion of the public rights of way network, will be supported. Development which would result in the loss of existing PROWs will not be permitted unless alternative provision or diversions can be arranged which are at least as attractive, safe and convenient for public use. This will apply to PROWs for pedestrian, cyclist, or horse rider use.

Carlton Colville Country Park

- 7.16 As part of the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan allocation of the Bell Farm site, an area of at least 15 hectares is required to be delivered for a Country Park. Policy WLP2.16 states:

'The country park should be located to the west of the site and provide protection to the setting of the Scheduled Monument and Grade I listed Holy Trinity Church. It should include a fenced neighbourhood equipped area for play and an open landscaped area for dog walking and other recreation.'

- 7.17 To meet these objectives and to also reflect the aims of our environment policy we have identified important principles and an illustrative layout for the Park. This framework builds upon the experience learned from the new park in Oulton and through feedback from the local community. Whilst the principles provide a detailed list, it is recognised that there must be flexibility in what is delivered to meet the overall objectives. Nevertheless, the following have been identified as important aspects if the country park is to be a successful thriving space:

1. To meet the play objective, a new play area is suggested for inclusion within the proposed development area utilising land identified for flood mitigation. This could supplement existing play equipment areas at Hall Road Community Hall, Carlton Park Play Park and the Dales development (Bloodmoor Hill). However, the country park could provide an additional opportunity for adventure play.

2. Accessible by and through the park. Main routes could be tarmacked or compacted stone paths for all ages and abilities, by foot, by buggy, by cycle and mobility aid. Main paths could be at least 3 metres wide to allow two wheelchairs or prams to pass comfortably. Other paths around the park or in sensitive environmental areas could be wood chip or equivalent.
3. Adequate parking for people using the park. The suggested location should be close to the existing Carlton Colville Primary School on Gisleham Road. This is so that visitors from outside the community don't have to travel through the existing community or through the new development to access the park.
4. An historical trail around the scheduled monument.
5. Create a natural 'amphitheatre' to allow for structured play/open air meetings/performances.
6. Create suitable area for field study or family gatherings.
7. Create a night-time observatory site to allow star gazing.
8. Create a 'keep-fit' trail/route.
9. Restore hedges, plant native trees - create a series of copses and natural scrub areas to encourage wildlife.
10. Work with Historic England to enhance the natural and learning opportunities of the scheduled monument.
11. Create a community orchard – the Town Council would look to form a community group (or groups) that would like to be part of planting and maintaining this.
12. Pathways suitable for all forms of transport and planted either side with trees (a bit like the path around Normanston Park - providing interest and shade).
13. Create 'zones':
 - Community orchard
 - Heritage area near scheduled monument
 - Dog walking/recreation
 - Managed grassland for ground nesting birds (restricted access during nesting)
 - Woodland.
14. Suitable layout for use for a themed festival/fete/carnival (Carlton - summer solstice/winter solstice festival) (Charity/community fundraiser)

- 7.18 Development proposals are encouraged to include provision for a comprehensive management plan for the country park.
- 7.19 To aid the development of proposals for the Country Park, Figure 7.1 below provides an illustrative overview of the opportunities the site offers. Again, this is intended to be illustrative, however it has been informed by wider thinking about the location of the site and its relationship with surrounding areas and the community of Carlton Colville.

POLICY CC8: CARLTON COLVILLE COUNTRY PARK

Proposals to deliver the Carlton Colville Country Park (required as part of the development of land at Bell Farm, as allocated in Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy WLP2.16) should demonstrate how the principles shown in Figure 7.1 have informed the development of the masterplan. Provision is encouraged to be made for the range of activities shown.

APPENDIX B

The following improvements to cycling and walking routes were identified through the process of preparing the neighbourhood plan. The Town Council will seek to work with relevant stakeholders to help support delivery of these improvements where feasible.

Fig A (formerly fig 5.3) indicates these improvements on a map. It also identifies the ‘key corridor recommendations’ in the East Suffolk Cycling and Walking Strategy which can complement the improvements in providing a coherent and safe network of routes for non-motorised traffic.

- Improve Beccles road crossing points at (C1) Hollow Lane and at the junction of Chapel Lane and Marsh Lane (C4) - at the moment there are no crossing aids to allow pedestrian, cycle or mobility access across the Beccles road to the Broads Authority Executive Area and Carlton Marshes Nature Reserve. Suggested improvements would be to provide suitable traffic crossing facilities at these two points plus better signage and way-finding measures both to and from the important tourist and leisure sites (e.g. Carlton Colville Transport Museum and Carlton Marshes Nature Reserve).
- There are poor connections between the developments in the north of the Neighbourhood Plan area and those in the south plus the major retail, leisure and employment hub at Gisleham. A suggested improvement (R1) is that the main nonvehicular

movement south-north from the proposed Bell Farm development could be via Low Farm Drive, Shaw Avenue, Rounces Lane, Hollow Lane (linking separately to Capstan Way), Grove Road and Clarkes Lane. The benefits are to give safe walking and cycle routes to all primary schools, provide easier access to the Nature Reserve and link with the national cycle route.

- The main West-East route (R2) is fragmented and there are poor condition pathways creating difficulties for people trying to access retail and employment at South Lowestoft Industrial Estate. The suggestion is to join up current fragmented routes by better signage and clearer road markings from the proposed Bell Farm development (C), through the Dales Estate to Bloodmoor Hill where it links with a cycle path on Bloodmoor Hill or provides direct access to the South Lowestoft Industrial Estate for employment and retail purposes. East to west cycle routes would provide access to the proposed country park (B) and existing Primary School. It should be noted that some parts of this route are outside the Neighbourhood Plan, therefore Policy CC3 does not apply.
- Pedestrian access to the dedicated foot and cycle path on Bloodmoor Hill (C2 – see picture below) - the issue is the ramp goes over the road to Pakefield side and does not allow cycle, pushchair or wheelchair access to the existing dedicated path and cycle way running alongside Bloodmoor Hill. There are steps down but these cannot be easily managed by pushchairs, other forms of mobility and cyclists. A suggestion would be to replace the steps with a ramp on the Dales development side which would encourage both pedestrians and cyclists to access the retail and employment opportunities on the Gisleham Estate more easily and safely reducing pressure on car usage.
- South/West routes (R3) could provide access to sports and social sites at Oakes Farm (A) via Rushmere Road/Secrets Corner and Hall Road traversing the National Cycle Path. A suggested improvement would be to access a cycle free route from the proposed Oakes Farm sports development alongside of Hall Road to Secrets Corner, Rushmere Road then accessing the country park to provide off road route all the way to Carlton Colville Primary School. This would be assisted by the widening of Hall Road.
- The existing National Cycling Route between Beccles Road and Mutfordwood Lane is indirect. A suggested improvement would be to provide a cycle path as part of any development at Oakes Farm to connect Castleton Avenue to Mutfordwood Lane.

- Improvements to west end of Castleton Avenue (Swallowfields) (C3). Currently the well-used route remains uncompleted. A suggested improvement is that the short, incomplete cycle path could be completed from Swallowfields to Beech Road which will extend connections in this part of Carlton Colville and provide direct access to sports facilities. Safer crossing of Castleton Avenue is also required.



Write to us 

East Suffolk Council
Planning Policy and Delivery Team
Riverside, 4 Canning Road,
Lowestoft, NR33 0EQ

Call us 

Planning Policy and Delivery Team (Local Plans)
01394 444557

Development Management (Planning Applications)
01394 444832

Email 

Planning Policy and Delivery Team (Local Plans)
planningpolicy@eastsoffolk.gov.uk

Development Management (Planning Applications)
planning@eastsoffolk.gov.uk

This document is available in alternative formats and in different languages on request. If you need support or assistance to help you read and/or understand this document, please contact the Council using one of the methods above.