

**Ipswich Urban Character Supplementary Planning Document –
Chantry, Stoke Park & Maidenhall**

Consultation Statement – September 2015

**Prepared under regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local
Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.**

A 'call for ideas' for the Urban Characterisation Study supplementary planning document was included in the February 2013 Local Plan Newsletter, which is circulated to everyone on the Local Plan mailing list and published on the website. This invited comment on the scope and content of the document prior to preparation commencing. The responses are reproduced in the table below together with the officer's response.

| Respondent | Comment | IBC Response |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Archaeo-logical Officer, Suffolk County Council | <p>Following February's Ipswich Local Plan Newsletter, I would like to comment that consideration of Ipswich's archaeological remains and the archaeological / historical / topographical evidence for the long development of the town should be within the scope and content of the Ipswich Urban Characterisation Study.</p> <p>The below-ground archaeological remains give a time depth to understanding the development of the town, and many elements of the town and its streets as it is today were shaped from its earliest days (as an internationally significant Middle Saxon trading centre). Identification of sites of particular interest and the nature of deposits across the town would also guide developers and planners as to archaeological concerns.</p> | <p>We have worked with the County's archaeological officer to identify and highlight important archaeological aspects of the Study.</p> <p>The officer has been invited to prepare archaeological summaries corresponding to each of the character areas, which have been prepared in draft form along with maps illustrating the location / extent of finds.</p> <p>These will be incorporated in late drafts of the character area summaries, in the 'history' section</p> |
| Private individual 1 | <p>In response to your consultation I assume that the following will be part of the special character and distinctiveness of Ipswich: the attractive old town-centre and its</p> | <p>The nature of the Study has been explained in a direct response to this correspondent. This is that it will not cover areas of the</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>human scale the number and beauty of our parks the easy access to outstanding countryside, seaside and estuaries and their flora and fauna the Education Quarter and Waterfront businesses, etc.</p> <p>I think it is important that the town's manufacturing history, especially engineering (part of the family history of so many residents), is also included. It would have been good to feature some outstanding remaining buildings but I do not know of any. The volunteer-run Ipswich Transport and Engineering Museum does a first class job but in a poor location and it is just not good enough that the nearest agricultural models are at Stowmarket. I think the answer would be to move the Transport and Engineering Museum to a central location where the engineering section could be expanded.</p> | <p>town centre already designated as Conservation Areas (although the complement with these areas is made clear in the Study). It will, however, cover areas of former industry, since these tend to lie in undesignated parts of the town. An example is the 'Valley' section which covers areas of former industry, the docks and the railway, especially in Stoke.</p> |
| <p>Private individual 2</p> | <p>The Portsmouth Urban Characterisation Study March 2011 is suggested as a good example to look at.</p> <p>It sets out objectives of the study as follows (1.7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify areas of the city that have broadly similar characteristics; • inform the Portsmouth Plan (Core Strategy) and other documents in the Local Development Framework; • identify the key elements that contribute positively and negatively to the overall character of the city; • provide the basis for more detailed character assessments including Supplementary Planning Documents, Area Action Plans and Conservation Area Appraisals, and | <p>The Portsmouth Study was used as a basis for planning the document content, together with similar studies for Brighton and Plymouth. Like these studies, it uses a 'character area' approach based on shared physical characteristics, rather than existing administrative boundaries.</p> <p>Its intention is to provide a baseline for Planning Officers against which to judge the contextual aspects of planning proposals. It will also provide a resource for applicants, to inform design and the content of Design and Access</p> |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a benchmark for monitoring the impact of future development. | <p>Statements.</p> <p>It complements the existing suite of Conservation Area Appraisal documents, and will provide a point of reference for future planning publications such as Development Briefs.</p> |
|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Following approval of the consultation draft of the Ipswich Urban Character Study supplementary planning document at Executive on 16th June 2015, a six week consultation exercise was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement March 2014 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) England Regulations 2012 (Regulations). This was undertaken alongside consultation on a further draft Supplementary Planning Document and a call for ideas on a five Supplementary Planning Documents, and details were circulated to everyone on the Local Plan mailing list, published on the Council’s web site, emailed to those on the Ipswich Direct email service and publicised through a press release and via social media. The Local Plan mailing list consists of specific and general consultation bodies, and private individuals who have expressed an interest in Local Plan matters.

The consultation ran for six weeks between Monday 6th July and Monday 17th August 2015. The minimum four week consultation period prescribed by the Regulations was extended to six weeks because of an overlap with the school holiday period. The responses are reproduced in the table below together with an account of how these have been addressed in finalising the SPD.

| Respondent | Comment | IBC Response |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Historic England | <p>Supports the production of the local distinctiveness SPD for Chantry, and the emphasis on ‘History’.</p> <p>Designated assets should be shown on a single map – conservation areas, listed buildings, locally listed buildings and scheduled monuments.</p> | <p>The emphasis in the SPD is on undesignated assets – designations are shown only where they form local landmarks. It is also important to maintain a distinction between the urban character areas and conservation areas, which have their own appraisal documents.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>The 'Landmarks and Views' map should show views of the area from outside the area boundary, as well as from inside.</p> <p>Opportunity sites should be identified which detract from the distinctiveness of the area, where there may be scope for improvements – these could be the basis for development briefs.</p> | <p>The draft Core Strategy Review refers to significant views through revised policy DM5. The identification of significant views into the character area would be a helpful addition to the database. However, it would require a significant amount of additional research and mapping, and would not be a practical task to undertake prior to adoption. It could, however, be considered as a future revision to be undertaken post adoption, perhaps once all the chapters of the SPD have been adopted.</p> <p>Identifying specific sites would be a significant addition to the degree of guidance offered by the SPD. It is considered that local distinctiveness is too narrow a basis for identifying site development opportunities which may have wide ranging implications.</p> |
| Ipswich Buses | <p>Support this thorough document, which offers an excellent summary of the area concerned and a positive forward vision.</p> <p>Would like to see the bus put in a cleared context within this vision.</p> <p>Would support the introduction of 20mph zones and shared spaces around key movement centres and would be prepared to invest extra time in schedules</p> | <p>IBC agree that bus use is a crucial part of the transport provision in this area. The SPD emphasises the post-war planning which has created an accessible road network with loop routes and clearly defined, successful local centres which support bus services.</p> <p>There is also an issue with excessive vehicle speed in the Chantry and Stoke Park area and the SPD draws attention to the need to restrict this. In the</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>to mitigate the impact on our operations as would all us to compete more effectively with the car. The policy advocates such measures to promote walking and cycling but it should also encourage bus use as a further sustainable option. In designing such features would be keen to see the replacement of speed humps. Some of the current pinch points (designed to reduce car speeds) are adversely affecting buses.</p> <p>Much comment is made of the damage to verges where cars are parked on the verge. Where parking occurs part on/off the road buses are often slowed because they cannot pass parked vehicles. This decreases the attractiveness of the bus. In certain areas smaller buses are needed due to parked cars, consequently making them more expensive to operate.</p> <p>Cluttered street parking also slows buses and prevents them accessing the kerb to load and unload mobility impaired passengers and wheelchair users.</p> <p>It would probably support the thrust of the proposed policies to add the bus context to them.</p> | <p>absence of remodelling of road alignments, such features as pinch points and speed humps do at least manage to mitigate vehicle speeds, and the same could be said of verge parking.</p> <p>For these reasons, IBC will restrict their text amendments to a reference to unrestricted verge parking causing obstructions.</p> |
| Natural England | The importance of green infrastructure (GI), biodiversity and landscape enhancements are insufficiently emphasised in the document. | The SPD already allocates a section to these subjects – the open spaces are mapped and there is a written description of biodiversity which emphasises the |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | importance of wildlife corridors and specific biodiversity enhancements (page 8). |
| Anglian Water | The SPD refers to a lack of tree planting within housing areas. It should also refer to the coordination needed between the planning of underground utilities, especially water, and the specification of tree planting. A recommended list of trees and shrubs for planting near utilities is attached. | The SPD does not go into detail about specific design approaches, because of the range of possible factors that need to be taken into account. Anglian Water's comment is welcomed but the species list and guidance on planting near utilities should be included in separate, more specific guidance. |
| Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service | The SPD misses a number of important references to archaeology in the area. | An archaeology section has been added which has been drafted by Suffolk CC Archaeological Service and which addresses the omissions. |
| Marine Management Organisation | No comments | N/a |
| Office of Rail and Road | No comments | N/a |
| Westerfield Parish Council | No comments | N/a |