

Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2037

Response from Mendlesham Parish Council to comments made during consultation on the Modification Submission Draft Examination issues.

Serial	Respondent	Summary of respondents comment	Mendlesham Parish Council response
(1)	Suffolk County Council	“ There have been no amendments made to the draft plan itself and as such our previous comments raised during the Reg 16 consultation still stand. We have no comments to make on the amended Consultation Statement and the SEA screening documents.....”	Noted.
(2)	Natural England	“ Natural England does not have any specific comments on consultation	Noted.
(3)	Historic England	“ No further comments to make at this stage”	Noted.
(4)	Highways England	“ We have reviewed the plan and note the area and location that is covered is remote from the A14. Consequently the draft policies set out are unlikely to have an impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer No Comment” .	Noted.
(5)	Water Management Alliance	Enc previous comments with regards to surface water drainage strategies . With regard to “ major development site ...located to the south of Glebe Way (Section 1.3.1.2 of the SEA Screening Report). Please refer to the recommendations made by the Board in our letter of 10/08/21 in the attached document. The Board has no further comments to make with regards to the document relevant to this focused consultation”	Noted.
(6)	Marine Management Organisation	No bespoke response received. Enclosed information regarding the organisation and sources of policies.	Noted.

<p>(7)</p>	<p>Resident Mr Stiff</p>	<p>Comments summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Report SD25 is purely a position statement on traffic conditions in 2019. No attempt made to predict traffic conditions into the future. Most importantly, no attempt made to predict traffic conditions after the new bypass/link road connecting Old Station Road and Church Road referenced in MP1 has been constructed. This will see a significant worsening of the quality of life for residents of Glebe Way and Freelands. • The PC acknowledge that the new road connecting Old Station Road to Church Road will provide opportunities to relieve pressure on the conservation area and it acknowledges there will be an increase in traffic in Glebe Way, but claim this will be inconsequential as a result of traffic calming. If traffic calming could reduce the expected traffic flows along Glebe Way there would be no reduction in the conservation area. The PC needs to state what speed reduction it considers acceptable, what it expects to achieve and needs to identify the traffic calming that will achieve that. Such traffic calming does not exist. • The most effective means of reducing traffic speeds is a series of road humps which would provide a significant noise impact on nearby residents. • Glebe Way would not be suitable as a bypass. It was built over 40 years ago, and designed geometrically and structurally as a cul-de-sac. The design of a cul-de-sac is different to that for a through road. Safety requirements of visibility for the two types of road are different. As a result, safety will be compromised. Additionally, Glebe Way will be unsuitable for a through road carrying large vehicles. To make it a suitable standard would entail a major reconstruction of the carriageway. That would be a major cost that I suspect had not been allowed for. (Has the cost of traffic calming also been omitted?) 	<p>In response to the concerns raised by Mr Stiff on the impact of traffic following the development of the site adjacent to Glebe Way (identified as SHELAA reference SS0065 in policy MP1 of the revised NDP.)</p> <p>This has been a difficult issue to address. The NP team and Mendlesham PC have concerns over the volumes of traffic that will be generated by the new dwellings from this site and other sites around the village which already have planning permission; these concerns were expressed by the public in our consultations over site selection.</p> <p>To attempt to alleviate the traffic concerns there was agreement that, if possible, this particular site should have two entry and exit points, one into Old Station Road and the other into Church Road. This would enable traffic from this site to largely avoid passing through the village and conservation area.</p> <p>The use of the term “bypass” is incorrect. Unfortunately, Mr Stiff has not referenced his source. It is a term that may have been used by residents as part of the consultation process and indeed is a term that will have been used by residents and documented in Parish Council minutes whilst our work was ongoing. However, it is not a term used as part of the NP documentation. The need to identify such a route which would take all traffic around and through SS0065 was rejected at a very early stage, primarily on grounds of cost but also on a suitable route not being available</p> <p>Our current draft NP documents, in particular MP1 evidences and requires the need for any new residential development on SS0065 to have 2 accesses, one into Old Station Road and the other into Church Road. The actual positioning of these</p>
------------	--------------------------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parish council has not demonstrated what options were considered for a bypass. It is usual practice to investigate different options and to show that this has been done, so that decisions are made after considering all relevant facts. • I think that the PCs reaction to the impact on Glebe Way is to not take the issue seriously. It wants to reduce the traffic in Front Street significantly and this would be at the expense of the residents in Glebe Way. It tries to play down the impact on Glebe Way, but if the impact on Glebe Way is small there will be little benefit for Front Street. Thus the PC would want the traffic calming in Glebe Way to be useless. • In its Consultation Statement, it is stated that the parish Council made residents aware of the consultation. This did not occur with me despite me writing to the parish council with some of my concerns in April 2021. • The minutes of meetings of the group preparing the MNDP are, contrary to what is claimed, not available online. I argue that it has been made difficult to obtain some minutes and some were denied, making me say that some meetings took place secretly. 	<p>two accesses would be subject to the applicant's planning and highways agreement.</p> <p>Mr Stiff does not reference the source of his comments regarding traffic calming for any amendments to the current road known as Glebe Way or indeed any future changes. We have not considered this matter or any impact on the current residents of Glebe Way as the issues of traffic levels, road capacity and signage will be dealt with via the planning permissions for the site. We also note that any new road for residential development must allow for the use of refuse collection and delivery vehicles.</p>
--	--	---	--

Dated: 19 May 2022