

Ipswich Borough Council Response to Comments made by The Ravenswood Environmental Group Day 1, Sessions 1 – Site Notices

During the Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR) Hearing day 1, sessions 1, The Ravenswood Environmental Group raised concerns that for the Ravenswood locality there was a lack of adequate consultation. It was contended that having individual site notices for the Ravenswood allocations IP150a through to 150e mislead the public as to the scale of development proposed at Ravenswood. The Council responds as follows:

The Council carried out the ILPR Regulation 18 (Preferred Options) and Regulation 19 (Final Draft) consultation in accordance with the adopted Ipswich Borough Council Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and erected site notices in the vicinity of land identified for development. As stated during the Hearings, the Council considers that the consultation process was successful in terms of alerting the public to the content of the plan. The proposed policies map showed what was proposed for the Ravenswood Area as a whole and made clear the content of the plan, enabling the public to make representations as appropriate. This complies with the Council's adopted SCI.

It should be noted that the Council used other methods of consultation including: emailing all interested parties on the local plan consultation database; publishing consultation documents on the Council's website; placing paper copies of the consultation documents and printed forms at the County Library, the Customer Services Centre and Grafton House; advertising the consultation through a public notice in the Ipswich Star and East Anglian Daily Times, and the Council's website and social media (including Twitter) and carrying out public exhibitions (see Appendix 1).

Ipswich Borough Council Response to Comments made by Save Our Country Spaces (SOCS) Day 3, Sessions 2 and 3 – Site Notices

During the Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR) Hearing day 3, sessions 2 and 3, the group Save Our Country Spaces (SOCS) contended that there had not been compliance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) because site notices erected to identify and alert local residents to the Humber Doucy Lane allocations were located in the wrong locations. The Council has looked into the matter and responds as follows:

The Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement Review 2017 (SCI) states that where a development plan document identifies a development proposal relating to a specific area of land, the Council will post site notices in prominent locations within the area. However, the Council is not wholly reliant on site notices to notify residents of proposals.

The Council carried out the ILPR Regulation 18 (Preferred Options) consultation in accordance with the adopted Ipswich Borough Council SCI and erected site notices in the vicinity of land identified for development in the Preferred Options ILPR. At larger sites the Council erected multiple site notices. At Humber Doucy Lane the Council adopted a precautionary approach and erected site notices around the perimeter of the site. The site notices were displayed for the full duration of the consultation (between Wednesday 16th January and Wednesday 13th March 2019). It should be noted that the Council used other methods of consultation including emailing all interested parties on the local plan consultation database; publishing consultation documents on the Council's website and placing paper copies of the consultation documents and printed forms at the County Library, the Customer Services Centre and Grafton House; advertising the consultation through a public notice in the Ipswich Star and East Anglian Daily Times, the Council's website and social media (including Twitter) and carrying out seven public exhibitions (see Appendix 1). This is considered to be a comprehensive approach to engagement.

The Council has looked back at the representation from SOCS at Regulation 18 (Preferred Options) and the representations refers to public notices issued by IBC and Suffolk Coastal District Council (now East Suffolk) being in the wrong locations. The site reference provided is in fact an East Suffolk reference (SCLP12.24) and does not relate to the site notices erected in connection with the Ipswich Local Plan Preferred Options consultation (see Appendix 2). Photographic evidence of the site notices has been requested but not supplied by SOCS.

The Council considers that it has complied with the Ipswich Borough Council Statement of Community Involvement and made every effort to engage with the public in the plan making process. It is important to note that the SOCS consultation response to Regulation 18 was received on the 13th March 2019, the day the consultation closed. During the course of the Regulation 18 consultation previous to the receipt of the SOCS representation, the Council was not alerted to any incorrectly located site notices. In addition, the Council is not aware of complaints by other parties on this matter. Based on the information provided by SOCS we are of the view that the notice was erected as part of the East Suffolk Local Plan consultation, which would explain why the site reference number given on the notice did not correspond with the site reference in the ILPR. The Council is satisfied that its Regulation 18 consultation was carried out in accordance with the relevant regulation and the adopted Ipswich Borough Council SCI.

Ipswich Borough Council can confirm that SOCS have not raised this issue in relation to their submitted Regulation 19 (Final Draft) representation (see Core Document Library A17).

Appendix 1 – Preferred Options and Final Draft Consultations

Preferred Options (January – March 2019)	
Informing the public	Mailshot (emails/letters to residents and agents on mail list)
Public Events (Presentation given specific to Area Committees*)	Central Committee (9 th January) SW Committee (10 th January) SE Committee (16 th January) NW Committee (17 th January) NE Committee (24 th January) Town Hall (26 th January 10 – 4pm) Town Hall (14 th February 10 – 4pm and 17:30 – 20:00pm)
Advertisement, promotion and social media	Notice of consultation in Ipswich STAR and EADT Press release on IBC website and Local Plan consultation referenced in Ipswich Star article covering the Public Realm Strategy Twitter and Facebook pages (regular updates throughout consultation) Local Plan hand-out to accompany comment forms at events

Final Draft Options (12th January – 2nd March 2020)	
Informing the public	Mailshot (emails/letters to residents and agents on mail list)
Public Events (Presentation given specific to Area Committees*)	NW Committee (9 th January) Central Committee (15 th January) SW Committee (16 th January) Cliff Lane Primary School (in lieu of cancelled SE Committee) (21 st January) NE Committee (23 rd January) Castle Hill Community Centre (3 rd February) Town Hall (7 th February 1-7pm) Town Hall (8 th February 10 – 5pm)
Advertisement, promotion and social media	Notice of consultation in Ipswich STAR and EADT Press release on IBC website and Local Plan consultation referenced in Ipswich Star article covering the Public Realm Strategy Twitter pages Local Plan hand-out to accompany comment forms at events

*Ipswich has no parish Councils therefore local meetings for each area of Ipswich are undertaken by Area Committees. Ipswich is divided into five areas, and each of those areas are split into wards. There are three councillors per ward, representing the community and residents of that area. The Councillors from these Wards work with residents, businesses and community groups at these public meetings to discuss how money can be spent and how the area can be improved. The meetings are held 6 times a year.

Appendix 2 – Extract from SOCS Regulation 18 Representation

Specific Comments on SCLP12.24

The public notices issued by IBC and SCDC are in the wrong locations for this area and are there is therefore a potential breach of the planning law and Local Plan process.

This area has already gone through due process and is at odds with the adopted approach of organic growth around Local Service Centre's, and not a propose a large development on this site and in this area.

The Parish of Tuddenham is 'village', a NOT a Local Service Centre (LSC) which is deemed necessary and required to take this growth and development. Rushmere village is a LSC but does not have facilities and therefore fails the criteria for a LSC.

The area in question SCLP12.24 is part of the designated Green Rim and Green Corridor for Ipswich under current plan. It should remain so as there is a deficit of Green space in North and East Ipswich historically already identified in IBC Biodiversity and Open Space Policy Document. This proposal is unsound as it takes no account of the established Biodiversity and Open Space BC Policy.

Appendix 3 – Extract from the ILPR Policies Map

