

**Response from Kettleburgh Parish Council to Consultations on
Suffolk Coastal Local Development Framework
18 February 2009**

In order to make a valid response to the consultation, Kettleburgh Parish Council held a public meeting to give villagers an opportunity to give their views. A newsletter dedicated to this topic was delivered to all villagers, outlining the two specific consultation questions. Reference was also made to the information on the LDF contained in issue 38 of SCDC's publication 'Coastline'. The following comments are a summary of the views expressed at the meeting. They were approved at a subsequent Parish Council meeting.

Consultation 1. Core Strategy & Development Control Policies Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal of Core Strategy & Development Control Policies Preferred Options

Comments were welcomed on all or any part of the Core Strategy but SCDC are particularly keen to have our thoughts on two key issues:

(a) Policy SP2 –Settlement Policy and associated Appendix 1

(i) Does your parish council broadly agree with the way settlement types are sub-divided? If not why and what changes would you make?

Kettleburgh Parish Council Response:

No.

Why?

Various reasons are presented in Appendix SP2(i)

Proposed Changes:

Lower three categories should be:

- sustainable
- semi-sustainable
- countryside

(ii) Do you think your village is correctly positioned within the table; if not please give reasons? (*In particular, please provide an update as to what services and facilities currently exist*). This question is to be answered having regard to both the situation as it is now and having regard to future aspirations the community might have, for example as expressed through a parish plan.

KPC Response:

No.

Reasons:

We believe that Kettleburgh should be included within 'Other Villages' (semi-sustainable) we barely score sufficient 'points' to be described as a 'Local Service Centre' and we identify our village to be comparable to others currently included under 'Other Villages'.

[Various comparisons and reasons are presented in Appendix SP2(ii)]

Policies SP11 Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres; and SP12 Other Villages and Countryside and associated Table 1

(i) Does your parish council broadly agree with the type and scales of housing, employment and retail provision listed? If not why and what changes would you make?

KPC Response:

Housing – Yes

Employment – No

Why?

- Poor descriptor; question badly thought out
- Many people work from home
- No employment in agriculture any more
- Any business can now be run from home

Retail – Yes

Consultation 2. Site Specific Allocations & Policies Issues and Options

The Site Specific consultation comprises two elements:

- (a) The consideration of individual sites
 - (i) Does the size of the site and the likely scale of development proposed accord with the scales of development suggested under policies SP11 and SP12?
 - (ii) Where more than one site has been put forward which would be your preference and why?
 - (iii) Are there any other sites not listed, which the parish council would wish to put forward for consideration
- (b) The drawing of physical limits boundaries (village envelopes – the red line)
Comments are particularly sought on the criteria under Section 3 and also consider how the physical limits boundary might be redrawn if the criteria were applied.

KPC Response:

(Various comments made to Kettleburgh Parish Council are presented in Appendix ‘Consultation 2’)

- (a)(i) Given that the Parish Council believes that Kettleburgh should be included within ‘Other Villages’ the size and scale of potential development proposed is not in accord with the scale of development under policy SP 12 as no further development (Site Proposal 734) or a physical limits boundary (Site Proposal 546) would be expected.
- (a)(ii) Site Proposal 546 is a proposal to extend the current physical limits boundary (please note that the outline given on the sketch plans is incorrect) and thus as the Parish Council believes that Kettleburgh should be included within ‘Other Villages’ the proposal is irrelevant. Site Proposal 734 is proposed as a site for affordable (low cost) housing; as the Parish Council believes that Kettleburgh should be included within ‘Other Villages’ such a development would not be expected thus the Parish Council can express no preference as neither proposal is acceptable.
- (a)(iii) There are no other sites that the Parish Council wishes to put forward.
- (b) As the Parish Council believes that Kettleburgh should be included within ‘Other Villages’ then there shall be no physical limit boundary to draw and Section 3 thus becomes irrelevant.

APPENDIX SP2(i)

Qu. Does your parish council broadly agree with the way settlement types are sub-divided?

Ans. Kettleburgh Parish Council does not broadly agree the way settlement types are sub-divided for the following reasons:

- current descriptors are not equal and are arbitrary
- should have different weighting – Post Office/shop should carry more weight
- public transport is not 7 days a week or evenings, it does not constitute ‘public transport’ in the sense suggested in the LDF and is thus not viable
- any village can come up with a meeting place (e.g. in a church)
- pubs are closing at an alarming rate – will the descriptors be changed to reflect this?
- disappointing that both SP11 and SP12 consider two ranges within the hierarchy
- differentiation is too broad a brush in settlement hierarchy characteristics
- Kettleburgh lies 31/37 in population size within current Local service centres, Compared to Brandeston/ Easton: Kettleburgh has less facilities than other villages within this list
- Kettleburgh compared to ‘other villages’ sits better within this category.

APPENDIX SP2(ii)

Qu. Do you think your village is correctly positioned within the table; if not please give reasons?

Ans. Why Kettleburgh Parish Council does not think that Kettleburgh is correctly positioned within the table:

Village Name	Public Transport Bus Route to Town	Shop	Employment	Meeting Place	Post Office	Pub	Population (2001 Census)
Kettleburgh	118	No	No	Village Hall	No	Chequers	211

All the following are in category “Other Villages” but all have equivalent or better facilities than Kettleburgh

Boyton	71	No	Nursery, Garage	Village Hall	No	The Bell	154
Bromeswell	65	No	Nursery	Village Hall	No	Cherry Tree Inn	326
Cratfield	498	No	No	Village Hall	No	Poacher	299
Cretingham	118	No	Golf Course	No	No	The Bell	193
Levington	163	No	OOCL HQ Marina	Village Hall	No	The Ship	280
Newbourne	179	No	No	Village Hall	No	The Fox	310
Pettistree	64	No	No	Village Hall	No	Three Tuns Greyhound	205
Sweffling	119	No	No	Village Hall	No	White Horse	198

On this basis and comparison Kettleburgh should be grouped with ‘Other Villages’

In the following comparison with neighbouring villages Kettleburgh has no employment source. Thus Kettleburgh should again be grouped within ‘Other Villages’

Village Name	Public Transport Bus Route to Town	Shop	Employment	Meeting Place	Post Office	Pub	Population (2001 Census)
Kettleburgh	118	No	No	Village Hall	No	Chequers	211
Brandeston	118	No	School	Village Hall	No	The Queen	278
Easton	No	No	Easton Farm Park School	Village Hall		White Horse Inn	320

Looking at currently proposed ‘Local Service Centres’ the population of Kettleburgh is one of the very lowest:

	Village Name	Population (2001 Census)
1.	Sutton/Sutton Heath	1135
2.	Kelsale	977
3.	Wenhaston	818
4.	Aldringham	745
5.	Nacton	672
6.	Benhall	545
7.	Bucklesham	542
8.	Tunstall	511
9.	Badingham	478
10.	Little Bealings	445
11.	Walberswick	420
12.	Westerfield	413
13.	Hasketon	409
14.	Middleton	359
15.	Charsfield	358
16.	Clopton	344
17.	Campsea Ashe	342
18.	Friston	340
19.	Hacheston	322
20.	Easton	320
21.	Bawdsey	319
22.	Bredfield	308
23.	Parham	305
24.	Theberton	303
25.	Darsham	291
26.	Great Bealings	290
27.	Brandeston	278
28.	Rendham	262
29.	Blaxhall	233
30.	Marlesford	223
31.	Kettleburgh	211
32.	Shottisham	211
33.	Butley	201
34.	Little Glemham	173
35.	Straford St Andrew	171
36.	Swilland	164
37.	Chillesford	126
	Dunwich	N/a
	Rushmere St Andrew	N/a
	Thorpeness	N/a

Other comments:

Kettleburgh should be downgraded from a “Local Service Centre”- which it patently is not - to “Other Villages”.

Local employment and infrastructure does not support further development, we want to retain the remaining aspects of rural living.

Kettleburgh has only three of the characteristics of a ‘local service centre’, as has Cretingham. Consequently Kettleburgh should also more appropriately be classed among “Other Villages”. Certainly it is hard to see that there is real potential for it to grow as a sustainable self-supporting community given that the village has no –

- (a) employment opportunities,
- (b) shop,
- (c) school,
- (d) petrol station or post office.

APPENDIX 'Consultation 2'

Site Specific Allocations & Policies Issues and Options –

Comments made and adopted by Kettleburgh Parish Council:

- Proposals 546 & 734 are at present outside physical limits.
- There is a risk that if clusters were joined up we would be in danger of future development.
- Over a period of time the number of houses has increased by 50%, facilities have decreased by 75%.

Housing stock has increased by over 40% in the last 20 years.

18% of Kettleburgh housing is already affordable.

- Despite the current planning boundary having been established for 20 years, this has not restricted appropriate growth. There has been a significant increase in the number of dwellings in the village in the recent past with houses built to suit all social aspects. In the last three years eight new dwellings have been added to the housing stock and there is still potential for further development within the current boundary with three as yet undeveloped sites having been granted planning permission. This significantly exceeds development in neighbouring settlements of comparable size. It suggests that the boundary does not need to be recast at the present time. There is no evidence to suggest that any additional housing would be taken up by "locals"; certainly this has not been the case with recent housing development.
- People choose to live in villages because they enjoy the benefits – or lack of benefits - that a rural location provides.
- Growth at the rate we are seeing will lead to "Urbanisation" & eventually make our village unrecognizable.

In our village we already have 18% of the housing stock (that is almost one in five) built or classified as either "Low cost", Shared Equity or Starter homes and not always allocated or used as originally intended. We do not need any more!

In 2001, at the time of the Church Fields development, a petition was signed by villagers to stop the breaking into the field (which is now the proposed Site 734). Church Fields was developed under AP37 – and no development was ever to be allowed adjacent to Church Fields. A planning consultant was involved, and was concerned about the retention of the view of the church.

- The current attractive character of Kettleburgh is partly a consequence of the village being spread out with distinct breaks in its development owing to fields bordering the road at various points. Site 734 comprises one of these fields, and its development would eliminate a feature which adds to the village charm. Development would also have a deleterious effect on the current attractive approach to the cluster of three listed buildings, comprising the Grade I listed St Andrew's Church, Church Cottage and the adjacent thatched cottage. The lower end of Church Road is already one of the most intensively developed parts of the village. It would be inappropriate to add to this, particularly having regard to the following traffic considerations:
The exit from Church Road to The Street is not suited to more intensive traffic use. The exit interfaces with (a) a sharp (and potentially dangerous) bend at the bottom of the steep hill on the Framlingham road, (b) the junction with Rectory Road and (c) the site of the bus stop. All of these are only a few metres away from the Church Road exit. There is significant 'on road' parking in the lower part of the road due in part to some houses having no garage/driveway parking. Consequently both these occupiers and their visitors typically park in the road. The resultant need to negotiate parked cars can already be problematic for traffic, and this situation could only be exacerbated by further development. Church Road is a 'no through road'. At the point where it first adjoins Site 734 it becomes a private, partly unmade, very narrow driveway. There is no right of way through the driveway at Church Cottage or Church Farm. Consequently the road is effectively a 'dead end'. As a result, refuse lorries and vans making deliveries to houses further up on the private road are frequently compelled to reverse back down towards Church Fields. The hazards attached to this manoeuvre would inevitably be increased by housing on the proposed Site.
Site 734 adjoins a Special Landscape Area which would be impacted negatively by further housing development.