

FRAMLINGHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

CONSULTATION STATEMENT - CONSULTATIONS/SURVEYS/MEETINGS

Task	Date
The Future of Framlingham letter sent to all organisations in the town	January 2012
Organisations Questionnaire	July 2012
Public Meeting	July 31 st 2012
Public Meeting	November 29 th 2012
Working Groups Launch Public Meeting	January 24 th 2013
Public Meeting	July 17 th 2013
Public Workshop	March 17 th 2014
Public Meeting (drop in session 2.30 – 7.30)	March 18 th 2014
Public Meeting (drop in session 2.30 – 7.30)	June 3 rd 2014
Steering Team Meetings	7 th March 2013 4 th April 2013 20 th June 2013 15 th August 2013 24 th Sept 2013 31 st Oct 2013 28 th Nov 2013 16 th Jan 2014 24 th Feb 2014 28 th Feb 2014 2 nd April 2014 24 th April 2014 22 nd May 2014 30 th July 2014 11 th Sept 2014 25 th Sept 2014 6 th Oct 2014

	<p>31st Oct 2014</p> <p>11th Nov 2014</p> <p>17th Nov 2014</p> <p>29th Jan 2015</p> <p>5th Feb 2015</p> <p>25th Feb 2015</p> <p>25th March 2015</p> <p>16th April 2015</p> <p>18th May 2015</p> <p>18th June 2015</p> <p>1st July 2015</p> <p>16th July 2015</p> <p>24th Sept 2015</p> <p>17th Dec 2015</p> <p>14th Jan 2016</p> <p>11th Feb 2016</p> <p>17th March 2016</p> <p>19th April 2016</p>
Public Workshop	19 th June 2014
Meeting with SCDC Hilary Hanslip and Andy Macgibbon plus ST members	20 th June 2014
Market Hill Consultations during the Saturday Market	15 th Feb 2014 12 th July 2014
Town Council Office Issues and Options Consultation	1 st – 31 st October 2014
Christmas Festival pitch	12 th December 2014
Fram Country Show	11 th and 12 th April 2015
Preliminary Mapping and Land Allocation Public Meetings	30 th April 2015 and 1 st May 2015
Preliminary Mapping and Land Allocation Public Meetings	22 nd May – 10 th June
Pre-Submission draft NP	11 th August – 24 th September
Employment Site Allocations Public Consultation	December 28 th 2015 – January 8 th 2016
Pre-Submission Public Consultation Draft NP (Reg 14)	18 th January – 28 th February 2016

FRAMLINGHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**PRELIMINARY MAPPING – HOUSING****SITE-ALLOCATION PROPOSALS**

<u>Site Location</u>	<u>Housing Numbers</u>	<u>Preference Position</u>	<u>Ranking Position</u>
Atlas Fram, New Rd	16	1	3
Old Gas Works	7	2	1
Green Shed	7	3	5=
Vyces Rd	14	4	2
Saxstead Rd (opp TMHS)	11	5	9
Off Victoria Mill Rd	30	6	5=
Station Rd Allotments	20	7 =	7
Police House	4	7 =	4
Mount Pleasant	99	11	8

Total 208

The SCDC Housing Allocation for Framlingham is 105 to 180, as per the Suffolk Coastal Issues & Options Consultation document. SCDC have subsequently, via their involvement in the planning process, requested a minimum of 180 in the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan.

The Mount Pleasant site is included in the site-allocation proposals because:-

1. To achieve the SCDC allocation we need to include a major development site.
2. The Sports Club project is insufficiently advanced to make it deliverable although it received a slightly higher number of preferences.
3. Mount Pleasant received a far higher ranking position (using 1 to 4 ranking of preferences) than the Sports Club, over 50% of those preferred Mount Pleasant ranked the development as 1st preference.

It never has been or ever will be our intention to exclude any consultation responses given by the community, however, the above figures do not include the public responses received during the 2 events held at Robert Hitcham's Primary School. During these events, the questions asked required a YES or NO answer. 89 returns were counted and reviewed, but the results did not help us to make any land proposals, as some of the questions did not request site preferences. We learned a lot from those 2 events and decided we needed to compliment the information we had by holding a number of follow up consultations in the town council offices. It is the results of these consultations that have been used to develop the site allocation proposals presented above.

PRELIMINARY MAPPING -PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACKHOUSING SUMMARY

<u>Total Preferences</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>SA Ref</u>	<u>Total No of Preferences</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Average Ranking</u>	<u>Ranking Position</u>
1	Atlas Fram	957	174	83	34	24	23	1.85	3
2	Old Gas Works		170	117	19	11	23	1.65	1
3	Green Shed		156	92	24	16	24	1.96	5
4	Vyces Rd	551	144	80	31	14	19	1.81	2
5	Saxstead Rd – opp TMHS	738	141	49	40	17	35	2.27	9
6	Land off Victoria Mill Rd		130	66	23	20	21	1.97	6
7	Station Rd – Allotments		105	60	8	9	28	2.05	7
7	Police House		105	47	19	10	29	1.87	4
9	Sports Club		100	35	23	9	33	2.40	11
10	Nth of Badingham Rd	989	96	32	22	15	27	2.39	10
11	Mount Pleasant	550	95	48	17	6	24	2.06	8
12	East of Fairfield Road	583a	43	9	9	6	19	2.81	12

Feedback Forms:-

Total Returns 286

Spoils * (40)

Nett Returns 246

*no preferences shown, the respondent answered with a NO to all housing locations.

Ranking :-

1 Most preferable

12 Least preferable

PRELIMINARY MAPPING -PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACKEMPLOYMENT - SUMMARY

<u>Total Preferences</u> <u>Position</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Total No of</u> <u>Preferences</u>	<u>Preference Ranking Spread</u>				<u>Average</u> <u>Ranking</u>	<u>Ranking</u> <u>Position</u>
			<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>		
1	North of Saxstead Rd	154	79	38	13	22	1.83	1
2	Off Woodbridge Rd	79	37	15	13	14	2.05	2
3	South of Brick Lane	47	21	11	5	10	2.09	3

Other preferences for employment sites not in nominated employment locations :-

Reads Bakery	81	54	12	6	9	1.62
Green Shed	81	40	23	3	9	1.62
White Horse Pub	70	34	16	8	12	1.97

Feedback Forms:-

Total Returns	286
Spoils	(31)
Nett Returns	<u>255</u>

J.A. Jones 20/6/15



FRAMLINGHAM

Neighbourhood Plan

FRAMLINGHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

EMPLOYMENT SITES

December 29th 2015 to January 8th 2016

RESULTS:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Yes-Preference</u>		
					<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
E1 New Street	44	23	1	68	33	11	-
E2 Brick Lane	14	53	1	68	2	7	5
E3 Woodbridge Rd	35	32	1	68	23	5	3

As a result of the public consultation both E1 New St and E3 Woodbridge Rd will be included in the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan Pre Submission (Reg 14) January 2016.

J.A.Jones
9th January 2016

PRELIMINARY MAPPING - PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

COMMUNITY USE - SUMMARY

<u>Total Preferences</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Total No of Preferences</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Average Ranking</u>	<u>Ranking Position</u>
1	Police House	125	79	25	10	11	1.62	1
2	Baptist Church	91	59	10	5	17	1.78	4
3	White Horse Pub	82	55	11	7	9	1.63	2
4	Vyces Rd	79	36	28	6	9	1.85	5
5	Sports Club	76	48	13	4	11	1.71	3
6	Behind TMHS	72	31	14	4	23	2.26	8
7	Saxstead Rd – Opp TMHS	53	22	11	6	14	1.90	6
8	West of TMHS	49	24	9	4	12	2.08	7

NB: This is only the top 8 of 18 preferences

Feedback Forms:-

Total Returns	286
Spoils	(31)
Nett Returns	<u>255</u>

J A Jones 20/6/15

FRAMLINGHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT – AUGUST 2015
POLICY PROPOSALS – FEEDBACK (Y/N)

	<u>The Way Forward</u>	<u>Housing</u>	<u>Infrastructure & Community</u>	<u>Local Economy</u>	<u>Travel & Transport</u>	<u>Waste Mgt & Renewables</u>	<u>Non Land Actions</u>	<u>TOTAL Comments</u>
Yes only	170	122	153	168	142	187	19	-
Yes & comment	53	91	72	61	88	54	47	466
No only	5	3	5	2	3	3	4	-
No & comment	21	35	20	16	19	11	7	129
? & comment	5	5	6	6	5	3	5	35
? only	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	-
Yes & No & comment	5	3	3	5	2	1	0	19
Total	259	259	259	259	259	259	259	-
Comments	84	134	101	88	114	69	59	649

Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan Informal Pre-Submission Consultation Policy Feedback

The following comments are representative of those made by the Framlingham community during the 7 week public consultation period ending on the 25 September 2015. The detailed comments can be found on the forms submitted and filed for reference in the Framlingham Town Council office.

The Way Forward

In total 84 comments were made; they can be grouped under the following headings:-

In principle.

Infrastructure problems, growth - but only in a sustainable way.

Don't lose the beauty of the town.

Parking will get worse.

Make a town for young families.

Phase development.

Housing numbers are confusing/ clarify the allocations.

Evidence of site allocations proposed should be published.

Why plan for the maximum number of houses.

You need to clarify what small/ medium mean.

Need for time frames and assigned objectives.

Why is Mount Pleasant included.

Housing

In total 134 comments were made;

Phase development.

No large scale developments.

Contradiction between housing policies (small & medium) and allocation numbers / sites.

Need to address the need for more affordable housing for locals.

2 off road parking spaces minimum.

Small start up homes needed for the young.

Walkways and safe cycle paths to schools/town centre.

Infrastructure / Community Provision.

In total 101 comments were made;

Infrastructure improvements must be committed to and monies allocated, secured / ring-fenced for Framlingham.

Community Centre needed with sufficient parking, possibly multi-functional to make it economic. We need continuous footpaths and safer wider walkways in and around the town.

Additional town centre parking.

Create parking spaces on the edge of town with walkways to the town centre.

Move the Primary School to TMHS and develop the site.

Expand the medical centre.

Economy.

In total 88 comments were made;

NP needs to be more visionary where employment is concerned.

We need to find a solution to parking if we are to support the towns economy.

Visitors will stop coming if we don't address parking problems.

Limited support for 2nd Supermarket/ Convenience store.

White Horse site needs to be brought back into use.

E2 employment site is too big.

Travel and Transport.

In total 114 comments were made;

Improve the bus services to Campsea Ashe, Ipswich, Saxmundham and Woodbridge.

Re-route HGV's away from the town.

Re-locate the Bridge St bus stop.

By pass the town via Brook Lane and New St.

Address the parking problems in town.

Improve road safety with traffic calming and reduced street parking.

Improve cycling facilities.

Waste Management, Renewables and Green Space.

In total 69 comments were made;

There are inadequate re cycling facilities in

town. Encourage "Green Fram" initiatives

Protect green space / play spaces.

Litter bins on all new developments

Non Land Allocations.

In total 59 comments were made;

Initiatives required to improve town traffic flow.

Highways improvements required- footpaths, cycle ways, traffic calming measures, parking.
Who is responsible for the implementation of the actions.

Show appendix A and B on a map.

All new houses should be energy efficient

In addition to those comments made under each policy heading, there were others of a more general nature:-

We need a much tougher approach by the council.

Some proposals don't go far enough.

We need to work together more in the future. A lot of hard work has gone into this document

Good Luck.

Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan - List of Consultees:

- Statutory Consultees

Natural England

The Environment Agency

Historic England

Planning EE Highways England

Marine Management Organisation

Homes and Communities Agency

Network rail

Suffolk Preservation Society

- Authorities

Suffolk Coastal District Council

Suffolk County Council

Framlingham Town Council

Earl Soham Parish Council

Dennington Parish Council

Badingham Parish Council

Easton Parish Council

Kettleburgh Parish Council

Parham Parish Council

Hacheston Parish Council

Brandeston Parish Council

Saxtead Parish Council

Bruisyard Parish Council

Cransford Parish Council

Monewden, Hoo and Cretingham Parish Council

Gt Glenham Parish Council

Marlesford Parish Council

Little Glemham Parish Council

- Business Contacts (etc)

Framlingham Business Association

Persimmon Homes

Taylor Wimpey

Bennett Homes

Hopkins Homes

Land Owners/Agents



**Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)
January 2016**



Sustainable Growth for the Whole Community



**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PRE-SUBMISSION
PUBLIC CONSULTATION (REG 14)
18TH JANUARY – 28TH FEBRUARY**

Document and response form can be viewed and downloaded from
www.framlingham.com

Printed copies available to view in the Library (during normal opening hours)

Printed copies available to view in the Town Council Office where a member of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Team will be on duty to answer any questions on the following days and times:-

10am - 4pm – Every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday

(During the six week consultation period)

and

6pm -8pm - During the evenings of:

January – Mon 18th, Tue 19th, Mon 25th, Wed 27th & Thurs 28th

February – Mon 1st, Tue 2nd, Wed 3rd, Thurs 4th, Wed 10th, Thurs 11th,
Mon 15th, Tue 16th, Thurs 18th, Mon 22nd, Tue 23rd, Wed 24th & Thurs 25th

**PLEASE TAKE THE TIME TO READ THE PLAN AND RECORD YOUR
COMMENTS**

HELP US TO SHAPE THE FUTURE OF OUR TOWN



FRAMLINGHAM
Neighbourhood Plan

YOUR TOWN – YOUR PLAN – YOUR FUTURE

Public Consultation Comment Form

Consultation open from January 18th to February 28th 2016

As a resident of Framlingham you are invited to give your opinions on the draft neighbourhood plan via the pre-submission consultation (Regulation 14) process.

General comments should be made in Section 1.

Comments regarding specific areas or policies should be made in Section 2 with reference to relevant paragraph number within the plan

Please enter your *name and address* at the end of page 2

Section 1 - General Comment

Comment	



FRAMLINGHAM
Neighbourhood Plan

YOUR TOWN – YOUR PLAN – YOUR FUTURE

Section 2 - Specific Comment

Paragraph Ref	Comment

NAME	
ADDRESS	

DATE	
------	--

Framlingham N.P.– Reg 14 Response- Suffolk Coastal District Council.

Consultation period 18/01/2016 – 22/02/2016)

Background:

NOTE: Taking place within the timeframe of this consultation were the appeals into new housing provision on land off Fairfield Road (163 units) and land at Mount Pleasant (MP1 – 107? + units). There is also a resolution to grant planning permission at Mount Pleasant (MP2 – 99 units).

The appeal hearings concluded on 24th Feb – decision awaited.

Fairfield Road site is not a suggested allocation within the FNP. Land at Mount Pleasant is.

General:

- Photos source should be acknowledged. Could be note at front of back of document – all photos courtesy of the FNPST
- Proposals Maps – these are showing an inconsistent approach as to where the physical limits boundary is drawn. Some housing sites are included – other not.
- Need an appendix clearly indicating which “saved” policies will be superseded by your plan.
- What if any viability testing has been done in respect of individual policies? Are they deliverable?
- For all housing allocations an additional reference to the provision of affordable housing should be included. Consideration should be given the level of detail in the supporting text against each policy e.g. FRAM29 and FRAM30.
- Terminology – “This site is available for...” It should be available – ie be suitable and have a willing landowner, but what you are doing is “allocating” land for a specific use of uses.
- Evidence Base:- ensure ref is included to Retail Study Refresh 2015; also to the SCDC Leisure Strategy. Where you have specific evidence which has influenced your policy choice/requirements then a reference should be included within the supporting text.
- Policy Maps: At A4 they are small and not easy to read. We can provide larger scale plans if you so wish. Production even at A3 as a fold out for the document would be preferable and make the document easier to use.

The following analysis shows the written comment from SCDC and the responses made ;-

Specific Comments

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
Pgs 1 & 2	<p>Commentary and diagram are not strictly correct. Following submission to SCDC the Council has to publicise the plan and invite comments which are then sent to the examiner. This is a formal min 6 week consultation period. There is still therefore time for people to make comment.</p>	Amended wording.
	<p>Suggest diagram on pg 2 is presented in landscape format to allow the diagram itself to be made bigger. You could also add a timeline from when work started to now with anticipated timeline from now to when plan is "made". (happy to discuss if you want to do this)</p>	No Action
Para 1.2	<p>Question – is it useful to spell out that the Town Council appointed a steering group to undertake the work but that decisions remain with the Town Council.</p>	Wording amended
Para 1.12	<p>Suggest add an additional sentence or two to highlight topic areas which these strategic and saved polices cover eg strategy for Framlingham; housing employment, town centre which neighbourhood plan will replace / add detail to. It acts as signpost to what is coming up later in the NP.</p>	Suggested amendments included
Para 2.2	<p>Suggest add final sentence to effect it was from here that Queen Mary (add date) made her way to London to become Queen. (again</p>	Added

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
	signpost to tourist offer/ interest)	
Para 2.7	This paragraph could usefully be illustrated by a plan or ref conservation area appraisal	Reference included
Para 2.23/4	A plan showing the location of existing facilities and access routes would be useful. Gives people an early reminder of the existing situation before arriving at your Proposals Maps at the end of the plan.	A detailed map and full narrative pprovided.
Para 2.32	You may want to add in SCDC monitoring shows (May 2015) just 5 vacant units within the town centre (out of 76 units)	No Action taken
Pg15	Travel and Transport – might be worth providing a bit more context under the section Travel and Transport. Suffolk Coastal district is not well served by main roads – A12/ A14 other than that it is B and C roads. State which are the key routes closest to Fram which provide access to the wider area. (Thinking here that plan will be read by people who do not know the area). Might also want to give examples of where buses go to and examples of cost for travel eg to hospital.	Not considered necessary, no action taken
Para 2.34	Reference to footpaths -	Changed to pavements
Para 3.2	This paragraph paraphrases policy SP23. On that basis it may be worth noting that the Station Road site is the largest brownfield site in the district & that work has recently commenced (not just the demolition seen previously)	Wording amended accordingly and info updated
Para 4.3	Physical limits boundaries. The	

approach set out in this NP is different to that in remaining sites documents. Allocations are included within PLB to provide certainty as to where development will go and where countryside policies apply. It is an approach which SCDC state in their site allocations documents that they would encourage NP's to follow in an effort to ensure a consistent approach to these matters across the district. Whether you choose to adopt this approach or not is up to you. I am duty bound to point this out. If you do choose to amend your approach to be consistent with the SCDC documents, then a minor amendment would be required to policy FRAM1 to delete the first bullet point.

No change proposed-we will keep existing policy of including those sites that have received planning permission.

On a related point, sites with planning permission for housing are an important part of the district wide housing land supply. Within the Council's own Site Allocations Document and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan appendices 3 and 4 we have a list of sites for which there is an outstanding planning permission for 5 or more units. Appendix 3 provides a list up to 31/3/2015. Appendix 4 provides a list for period 1/4/2015 – 31/12/2015. We are also showing these on the relevant inset maps. Policy SSP1 and FPP1 refer to housing sites comprising both allocations and site for which there is an extant planning permission.

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
	<p>For the sake of consistency it would be useful if you could also show these sites on your proposals map. This is something that we will need to take up with each relevant neighbourhood plan team, not just yourselves.</p>	<p>Not considered practical- no action</p>
Para 5.1	<p>You need to state what is the base date for your 1600 figure.</p>	Done
Para 5.4 & 5.5	<p>Suggest include updated information as presented at the Framlingham appeal inquiry in Feb 2016 rather than the text in this paragraph which is misleading. It is information which is up to date as at the time you started your consultation.</p>	
	<p>Housing land situation Framlingham 2010 – 2027 (updated to 26/01/2016)</p>	
	<p>Completions 1/4/2010 – 26/01/2015</p>	
	<p>(source SCDC monitoring)</p>	
	<p>111 (106)</p>	
	<p>Outstanding planning permissions as at 26/01/2015</p>	
	<p>(source SCDC monitoring)</p>	
	<p>229 (167)</p>	
	<p>Suggested residual requirement as at 01/04/2015</p>	
	<p>(source Preferred Options Consultation Document pg 20)</p>	

200

Indicative minimum housing contribution – Framlingham 2010 – 2027

(source Preferred Options Consultation Document pg 20)

475*

*Issues and Options consultation suggested range between 443 and 518

Figures in brackets show position as at 31/03/2015

The differences in the outstanding planning permissions figures are a result of permissions granted between 01/04/2015 and 26/01/2016) as follows and area shown graphically on the map attached:

1. Land off Station Road (DC 15/0444) – numbers reduced from 140 to 99 units
2. The Woodyard, Vycles Road (DC 15/1090/ FUL) – new permission for 5 units
3. Land at Mount Pleasant (DC 15/2759/FUL) – new permission for 95 units
4. Cherry Grove, Vycles Road (DC 15/0756/FUL) – 1 unit
5. The Graylings, Mount Pleasant (DC 15/2185/FUL) – 1 unit
6. Land adjoining Sunview, Dennington Road (DC 15/2242/FUL) – 3 units

7. Hatherleigh Farm, Saxmundham Road (DC 15/3220/FUL) – 1 unit (new plot 3)

8. Land adjoining Sunview, Dennington Road (DC 15/4090/FUL) – 2 (additional to those in 6 above)

Planning permissions granted since 01/04/2015 will count towards meeting the minimum indicative residual requirement for Framlingham.

For the sake of completeness, SHLAA site 957 (Atlas Fram, New Road) is the subject of a current application for 16 units (DC 15/1949/FUL).

Para 5.7 & Policy FRAM2

I have checked your housing figures against our latest records and they would appear to be slightly short of the minimum required (475 over the plan period i.e to 2027) The important figure is the 475 total over the period 2010 – 2027. Our latest figures (to end of Feb 16) show 113 built, 5 under construction and 113 with planning permission but not started (including Mount Pleasant). This

Updated figures as at 8th

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
Para 5.9	leaves a requirement of 135 units. The maximum that you are intending to allocate is 105.	March and agreed by SCDC is a shortfall of 14 units which will be met by windfall (there are already 8 units in the pipeline)
Para 5.9	Could reference your SA evidence base work.	Reference included
Fram 22	<p>Question – the emphasis should be on the provision of new housing. The reference to car parking for the school – if a need has been identified how many spaces are required – what is the need v desire. 50 spaces seems an awful lot – what would that give the school in total? What thought has been given to who will be responsible for the car parking area – maintain it? Has the viability of this additional requirement been tested against other policies which also require affordable housing? What if anything have highway authority said about any need for a crossing point from the car park to the school if they are on opposite sides of the road? Will the education authority/the school contribute towards the car park provision? I am assuming the housing will be required to pay for the car parking therefore the emphasis should be on the residential not the car parking as the main use for the site.</p>	<p>FRAM 22- this policy has been amended to reflect recent update to the site information .The housing numbers don't change but the parking spaces reduce to 20 and the use of the parking revised to that of visitors rather than pupils. This information has been shared with all concerned.</p>
Fram 22	<p>Suggest add site area into the policy text. There is a discrepancy between the site area quoted in the policy and the supporting text. Text refers to 1.41ha – policy refers to 0.9ha.</p>	Text corrected to 0.9ha

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
Pg 27	Question has any assessment been undertaken as to the feasibility of reed beds or water harvesting in the context of Framlingham.	No Action
Pg 28 – 30 & FRAM6	Following the recent planning inquiry there appear to be important views into Framlingham from the south of the town around Fairfield Road. There may be others. Views of the college were also identified as important.	Additional views added , also included in public responses.
Pg32	Local Green Spaces. NPPG states A Local Green Space does not need to be in public ownership. However, the local planning authority (in the case of local plan making) or the qualifying body (in the case of neighbourhood plan making) should contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space. Landowners will have opportunities to make representations in respect of proposals in a draft plan. Can you confirm that the relevant landowners have been contacted?	Confirmed
Pg 34 FRAM7	What does the term “the proposal is of a limited nature” actually mean?	Wording amended
Pg 39 FRAM10	This policy refers to the provision of NEAPs and LEAPs. What is the rationale for when each of these would be required. The reference to LEAPs refers to a site size threshold of 15 units. The Council’s own SPG only requires a LAP for sites of 15 units. What thought has	

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
	been given to who would be responsible for these areas.	Reference removed
Pg40 FRAM11	Community growing spaces. This policy only relates to residential development. What potential is there for these growing spaces being provided within locally important green spaces?	Already exist
Pg 40 FRAM12	Why do you need two policies? FRAM25 provides the relevant site specific allocation for the community center. From the text it would appear that you consider DM31 to be sufficient in terms of other opportunities which may present themselves.	Agreed – remove FRAM 12
Pg 44 FRAM14	This policy is very general and supports new employment provision anywhere. Are these types of uses acceptable everywhere? Within the main town centre would you be happy for vacant retail units to be converted to business use?	If long term vacant then use as office space would be preferable.
Pg 44 FRAM15	This policy is very general and does not appear to add anything more to that in the Core Strategy policies already quoted.	See FRAM 16
Pg 45 FRAM16	I would suggest that Core Strategy policy SP7 Economic Development in Rural Areas covers the matters you are looking to address in the first bullet point. With regard to the second bullet point, is this something which would be picked up through your parking policies and other general design issues and NPPF section on heritage assets. Is the more	

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
	<p>appropriate question in relation to tourism how visitors are currently catered for – where do they park, what are they visiting – is there a need to manage car parks or drop off areas for visitors by coach for example.</p>	<p>FRAM 15 & FRAM 16 combined and additional narrative.</p>
Pg46 Transport	<p>I would suggest that reference is included in this section to the highway authority and to advice and comment from them which has fed into the plan. Issue is one of managing capacity of road network. Looking to provide people with realistic alternatives to the car for some journeys. It is not just looking at impact from new housing, it is looking at how that will also help existing residents. There are far more existing residents than new ones. Would be useful to explain what the improvements are that you are seeking to these foot/cycle ways. Is it improved surfacing/lighting/signage?? Will it require working with the local schools to encourage pupils to access them via these routes?</p>	<p>We are fully aware of the needs, for both new and existing residents. The need for resurfacing ,lighting ,widening and signage will be the subject of discussion with highways.</p>
Pg48 FRAM17	<p>I am not sure I understand this policy. I do not think it is enforceable as written.</p>	<p>Discussed with SCDC and no amendments required</p>
Pg 48 para 9.8	<p>This paragraph could include a commitment by the Town Council to continue working with the County Council as highway authority including public rights of way on measures which will improve the situation for cyclists and thereby encourage greater</p>	<p>Additional wording included.</p>

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
Pg 49 Highway Pinchpoints	cycling use. (This could be linked to tourism and those types of cycle route.	
Pg 51 Residential Parking Standards	Need to include reference in this section to the highway authority. For this policy to be enforceable it needs their support. If a traffic impact assessment is required in conjunction with a particular scheme, then it should be included as a criteria against that individual site specific policy.	Site allocation policies to include a traffic impact assessment.
Pg 52 Town Centre	Consideration should be given to expanding this policy for all forms of development covered by the SCC parking standards. It is equally important that for employment sites workers are able to park on-site for example. There are also issues in relation to delivery vehicles etc. The only additional element is the second paragraph which could still be retained. Paragraph 9.15 would then be redundant.	Amended accordingly
Pg 53 Sec 11	Suggest this policy is re-looked at having regard to the advice and guidance in NPPF and NPPG. This would suggest a more detailed approach is required. You could also look at the retail/town centre polices in the Site Allocations Document and the Felixstowe Area Action Plan. The policy should have a site map with it to show the extent of the town centre boundary as now defined/updated.	After discussion it was decided no action necessary at this stage.
Pg 53 Sec 11	To help people who do not know Framlingham that well, it would be helpful to show the extent of the	

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
Pg 54 Para 11.8	<p>Thomas Mill school site including playing fields to show how the education reserve site would be expected to relate to this. Is the site area identified following guidance provided by SCC? How is the boundary drawn / is there a willing landowner?</p> <p>Para 11.4 see earlier comments re the housing/car park site.</p>	Boundary included in plan and land owner is aware.
Pg54 Para 11.9	<p>This paragraph requires amendment. If the school moved, on-site car parking would be required as part of that development. It would not exacerbate existing parking problems.</p> <p>What type of crossing have the highway authority identified as required – zebra crossing; toucan crossing or just dropped kerbs? These all add cost which the developer would be expected to meet and therefore has impact for the viability of the scheme when other provision such as play area and affordable housing is added (as per your other policies). Has the viability been looked at?</p>	<p>See FRAM 22 comments.(re written policy)</p> <p>See FRAM 22 comments (re written policy)</p>
Pg55 FRAM22	<p>It is suggested that this should be first and foremost a housing allocation with a maximum site area identified for parking associated with the school plus crossing point. There is a difference between car parking for the school being required and it being achievable (see earlier comments re who will pay for it – who will maintain it etc)</p>	See FRAM 22 re written policy

The bullet point re access – is this a single access for the residential element and the car park? If single point of access will people unable to get a parking space in the car park then just park on the highway outside the new residential units?

Pg 55 FRAM23

This policy proposes allocation of this site for B-class type uses. This means a range of uses from B1 to B8. What thought has been given to how appropriate a full range of uses might be – potential impact on neighbouring/ nearby uses such as the school. If you are happy that this is a site where anything goes so be it. You may also want to provide a steer in terms of small units/ incubator units given that this is a type of accommodation that you have identified as needed. It may be that for some firms a new build would be more appropriate that a conversion of the type referred to in your earlier policy.

This is a typing error and should read B1 only, plan corrected

What were the highway views in relation to the combined impact of residential; school parking and new employment provision is close proximity?

School parking not an issue(see FRAM 22) – no comment from Highways

Pg56 Para 11.14

Question – if the need for additional education provision has not been identified in relation to the scale of growth provided in the neighbourhood plan and the site allocations work that SCDC are preparing is there a need to identify this as a potential site now. AS noted, there is opportunity through the Local Plan Review and

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
Pg 58 Para 12.8	<p>a review of the neighbourhood plan. If that is the case, does this land need to be identified now? If sites are otherwise allocated, is it at risk from development proposals?</p>	<p>It is felt there is a need for inclusion. No Action</p>
	<p>I have possibly missed an earlier reference, but if not, this is the first time that reference is made to the preferred strategy focusing on small and medium-sized development sites.</p>	<p>Included in Housing strategy !</p>
	<p>As an approach, where a site has now got planning permission or a resolution to grant planning permission, the Site Allocations Document still allocates the site (eg Darsham) but the policy picks up all of the relevant issues from the application itself and the decision notice i.e. in terms of conditions etc. It is recommended that the neighbourhood plan takes the same approach.</p>	<p>No Action</p>
Pg 59 FRAM25	<p>The site area seems tight to accommodate the size of community centre required plus housing. Has anyone produced any indicative layouts which would help confirm that the site is of suitable size. This may dictate the type/density of development which would be appropriate on site. (DC/15/0960/FUL) is a current application just for the almshouses. No reference to the community centre within the application but there is reference to the fact that the charity are looking to provide a community use on the remainder of the site. Suggest this policy is</p>	<p>No Action – site plan confirms suitable size.</p>

Page/Para No.	Comment	Framlingham N.P.S.T. Action.
	updated to reflect current position.	
Pg61 FRAM26	The policy references a number of other policies, but not the one re parking provision. If this is a difficult site to develop, has any consideration been given to providing more detailed guidance as to the type of dwellings which might be appropriate? Other issues such as layout/ impact etc	Add parking reference in policy statement
Pg 61 13.27	I assume that "this" is meant to read land adjacent to the existing cemetery.	Yes, wording clarified
Pg62 para 14.1 - 3	The paragraph refers to B-class employment floorspace. Is this for all B-class uses or more for some than others. Would be useful to know. In terms of legibility of the document, the introduction relates wholly to employment. It is then followed by a policy for housing.	Text correct, No Action
	I think it makes sense in this section – supporting text to make reference to the Fairfield Road housing scheme which is currently at appeal. It needs to acknowledge that the neighbourhood plan would be modified to reflect this should permission be granted.	Don't agree, Fairfield Rd is not in the plan site allocations .This was subsequently agreed with SCDC.
Pg 63 FRAM28	This site is of insufficient size in its own right to provide a NEAP – SCDC planning guidance suggests a NEAP for every 100 dwellings so might want to include reference as to how this will be provided ie contributions from other sites. The number of units proposed for this site seems somewhat low given the site area. 30dph is a low to medium density. Even with open	Agreed-remove reference to NEAP on this site.

space this site could take a potentially greater number.

Pg 63 FRAM29

The supporting text and the policy should make reference to the Station Road development and how it will relate to this. Also, how does this policy square with policy DM33 Allotments and your own policy re community growing spaces? If you are happy that this is not a suitable site for allotments – wrong location / whatever then it should be stated.

FRAM 29 title is misleading, it should refer to Off station Terrace, there is no issue with allotments. The landowners are in dialogue with the owners of the Station Rd development.

Pg 65 para 15.3 & FRAM21

The name of this site suggests that there may be issues of contamination which would need to be investigated. If this is the case then it will have implications in relation to site viability. Is there any background on this – any information gleaned from SCDC Environmental Services.

The T.C. are fully aware of the contamination issue. No Action

Pg 66/7

Information on delivery and review is limited. You may want to have a look at the work SCDC has included in its Site Allocations and Area Action Plan documents.

Comment noted

Response Ref No.	S1 Gen / S2 - Specific	POLICY FRAME:	Subject / Heading	Para. No.	Page No.	Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan Comments / Concerns / Key Issues Raised	Response / changes made to Neighbourhood Plan
11	S2		Approach	3.6	20	Section 15 should be Section 16.	Plan correct.
11	S2		Children's play areas	7.11	35 38	Fig. 6.2 - Play areas needed west side of town. Persimmon proposal tiny. Nothing for teenager's ball games.	FRAM 24
19	S2	FRAM10	Children's play areas	7.11	38	P38/9 7.11 Also Pol 10 - The provision of play areas in the West could be situated in the southern part of site of the Mills Brook Lane development. I feel there is insufficient space here for a large enough Community Hall together with the necessary parking space and, as the housing is intended for younger families, a play area would be far more suitable.	No Action - FRAM 10
26	S2	FRAM10	Children's play areas		39	Omit the paragraph starting 'Alternative locations.....'.	No Action required.
42	S2		Community centres	7.14	40	Church is already an adequate community centre so there is no need to build new.	No Action - church is inadequate.
47	S2		Community centres	7.15	40	Do we need to build a Community Centre if Sir Robert Hitcham's is a suitable site. It would provide extra parking for the town too. The roads leading to Vyces Road/Brook Lane would become too congested (very narrow in places).	Sir Robert Hitcham's is not available - No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

49	S2	Community and public events: Castle Church College Library			<p>The Library and the Church are the only freely accessible cultural/heritage centres in the Town. The theatre is part of Framlingham College and is open for community use and public events.</p> <p>Of central cultural importance is the historical heritage of the town, and the Lanman Museum is situated within the Castle and therefore is only accessible at exorbitant entrance fees.</p> <p>This causes an inevitable restriction of access, and limited pro-active participation of the local community - local people being largely seen as passive audiences, not actively engaged in creating their historical narrative and arts culture. There is a special role for developing more personal family narratives of the 19C and 20C history as it engages all parts of the local community, young and old alike, artistic or working people, including providing extra educational opportunities for schools in the locality. This does not easily fit in with the remit that English Heritage has for the more medieval nature of the castle.</p>	Referred to P.R. & Markets Committee.
34	S2	Community centre	7.14	40	Better position than Vycles Road & Brook Lane where residents are worried about the noise and traffic a community centre would bring.	Sit Roberts Hitcham's is not available - No Action.
01	S2	Community centres	7.14	40	Community Centre(s) desperately needed.	FRAM 12
36	S2	Community centres	7.14	40	I feel that the Church is already a community centre but is never so used. Why build new!!!	Church is inadequate - No Action.
52	S2	Community centres / facilities	7.14 7.16	40	Concerns regarding sufficient parking & increased traffic in Vycles Rd.	Community Centre Working Party to assess and decide based on factual study.
03	S2	Community centres / facilities		40	This space is not really big enough for any parking to go with a community hall.	Community Centre Working Party to assess and decide based on factual study.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

19	S2	FRAM12	Community centres / facilities	40	See above-there would need to be a lot of parking space associated with a larger Community Hall, with events likely to draw people not only from Framlingham but from surrounding villages and maybe further afield. I therefore feel the remaining space on Brook Lane/Vyces Road site would be too limited-the parking on Vyces Road has increased a bit over the years I have been here- and Brook Lane only has limited space.	Community Centre Working Party to assess and decide based on factual study.
20		FRAM12	Community centres / facilities	40	Is this required.	Community Centre Working Party to assess and decide based on factual study.
26	S2	FRAM12	Community centres / facilities	40	Include access to sufficient office facilities to be able to hold e.g. a public enquiry.	Community Centre Working Party to assess and decide based on factual study.
26	S2	FRAM11	Community growing spaces	40	Omit caveat 'unless.... to.... unviable.' If necessary put in the explanatory text. The Station Road allotment site ought to aim to have a community garden, as should the 'high density housing' on the Old Gas Works site (FRAM:31).	Removal of the caveat from the policy would make the policy unenforceable on small site development - No Action.
30	S2		Community organisations Community centres	14 40	2.26 7.14 Could not a substantial contribution towards providing a new community centre be extracted as a condition of planning consent?	C.I.L. payments - No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

49	S2		Community: Venue(s) / for activities		Provision of a venue, or venues, for a museum and a gallery, together with archive research & storage facilities, within the town centre would not only benefit local people and visitors culturally, but would also draw more people into the town from the castle and visitors from other parts of Suffolk into local shops, cafes and restaurants. The community Hall cannot prove suitable space and venue for these kinds of cultural activities as it is required to be a multifunctional facility, with changeable uses. A cinema and perhaps even a low stage for music / bands would be feasible here as these involve large audiences. Museums and galleries require more intimate spaces, and need to be within the town centre for them to succeed.	Referred to P.R. & Markets Committee - "Improvements in Town Centre".
06	S2		Consultation - Looking to the future	5	Reference to non-policy actions should read 16 and not 15: (see section <u>16</u>)	Plan corrected.
49	S1		Culture	1.9	<u>Historical Heritage / Arts / Drama / Media / Science / Environment</u> The Neighbourhood Plan should consider the specific requirements of different kinds of cultural activities and whether the town provides sufficient venues allowing opportunities for participation and events, and if not, where or how these needs can be met, both in the short term and the longer term future.	Referred to P.R. & Markets Committee - to consider opportunities for such events.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

49	S2		Culture Central Framlingham	15.00	65	The conversion of all old industrial / agricultural property to housing, retail or business use leaves little room for the kind of sympathetic informal eclectic spaces these types of activities thrive in. The old theatre, now used as an antiques centre, Carley's Yard vintage shop, and the Green Shed are typical examples of missed opportunities for cultural use within the centre of the town. One of the problems inherent with many cultural activities is that they require provision of infrastructure in order to flourish and are often seen as low priority by comparison with other needs. Their positive contribution to the wellbeing and prosperity of a town is often not generally recognised.	Referred to P.R. & Markets Committee - to consider opportunities for such events.
20	S2	FRAM4	Design standards		27	Woolly statement of intent <u>expected</u> Prefer <u>will</u> or some other statement compelling contractors to exceed best practise.	POLICY FRAM4 - Amended.
26	S2	FRAM4	Design standards	5.22	27	Remove 'Unless there are clear reasons why it is not possible.' Although the Building for Life 12 criteria sound reasonable generally, it would be informative to see a worked example e.g. how Mount Pleasant 2 scores.	No Action - Policy amended by removal of "expected to".
03	S2		East Framlingham	13.2	60	The Police Houses patch with parking in adjoining sports club is better.	No Action.
04	S2		East Framlingham	13.3	60	If the sports club in the future decided to re-locate. Possibly consider using for camping and possibly using existing facilities - Tourism.	No Action at this stage.
34	S2		East Framlingham	13.3	60	The sports club land at Badingham Road would be well used for housing and the sports facilities better placed up at Thomas Mills - plenty of parking.	No Action at this stage.
36	S2		East Framlingham	13.3	60	Relocate the sports facilities from Badingham Road to Thomas Mills School. Build houses in the space so created.	No Action at this stage.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

42	S2	East Framlingham	13.3	60	Move sports facilities from Badingham to Thomas Mills School. Build houses in space created.	No Action at this stage.
10	S2	Education	7.1	36	Should give priority to children living in Framlingham and local villages without schools.	No Action.
34	S2	Education	7.1 7.4	36 36	I agree that it is an excellent idea to move Sir Robert Hitcham school up to the Thomas Mills site safer too! I would have thought that this would release and excellent site for a community centre and possibly some 1/2 bed housing.	No Action at this stage.
47	S2	Education	7.2	36	What is to happen to the existing site if the primary school is located nearer to Thomas Mills High School Community Centre (or more housing). Hopefully not the latter!!!	No Action at this stage.
11	S2	Education and youth	2.16	12	Number of current pupils might be helpful.	No Action.
41	S2	Education and youth Education	2.17 7.2	12 36	Plans to move the primary school seem logical but there is no provision for the current site - can it be earmarked for community use (e.g. those in pgh 7.15)?	No Action at this stage.
03	S2	FRAM8 Education Provision		36	Moving the Primary School from the town centre will make children from the east of the town (Mowbray's etc) need transport. Bad idea, leave it as it is so parents will then be in centre for shops & socialising.	No Action.
50	S2	Employment and tourism	8	42	Few Towns would plan a major industrial unit at the main entrance. This will create a long term poor impression of the town for many visitors and residents alike.	General Employment Area already exists - No Action.
14	S2	FRAM1 Framlingham town physical limits		22	A very minor point but I think it should indicate the 'Proposals Map' can be found at P.68 & 69.	Plan amended as suggested.
28	S2	Framlingham Cemetery	13.6	61	Layout to include planting etc. to encourage wild life and a place to visit rather than a field full of graves! Avoid mediocrity!!	Suggestion included.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

39	S2	Framlingham Cemetery	13.7	61	<p>We need to extend the cemetery - at previous meetings I was told that the access to the proposed new cemetery would be from Saxmundham Rd. This has not been put in the plan - I am concerned that Infirmary Lane will become a route. As it is a public walkway & narrow and there are drainage of water issues this should be avoided. Someone who lives near to it wishes to terrace it over - if this happens then it will be an obvious access to a cemetery and/or housing. <u>*Please include the route into the cemetery on this plan!</u></p>	No Action.
12		FRAM21 Framlingham Town Centre		52	<p>Ent & Leisure in town centre has potential for disturbance, particularly when music is involved. An impact assessment should be part of any such application, but the inference from 21 is that all applications are welcome.</p>	No Action.
11	S2	Framlingham's past that has shaped the present	2.1	7	<p>Why is Wickham Market not included?</p>	Wickham Market is <u>not</u> a market town.
11	S2	Framlingham's past that has shaped the present	2.9	9	<p>Include heavy farm machinery.</p>	Plan amended.
11	S2	FRAM13 General Employment Areas	8.7	42	<p>Explain Classes B1 B2 B8 add New St/Saxtead Land.</p>	See Glossary of Terms.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

19	S2	FRAM13:	General employment areas	43	P43 Pol 13 (&P62 & 64 & Pol 30) - I fear that the use of Woodbridge Road site (presumably east of the B1116) would create a developed block that would jeopardise the site currently under appeal by Taylor Wimpey. The same goes for the land just to the east of the TW site. If we win the appeal against the housing, I feel these sites should continue to be protected to prevent potential "infill" claims by future developers.	No Action at this stage.
26	S2	FRAM13	General Employment Areas	43	Define classes 'B1 B2 and B8' development.	See Glossary of Terms.
34	S2		General employment areas	42 43	8.7 The NP mentions the "lost" site on Station Rd to housing. It also mentions Brick Lane. Brick Lane should be "lost" too - to all development plans - it is an important sensitive edge to the town.	No Action.
47	S2		General employment areas	42	8.7 Solar/Coop should never have been built where it was. Need a supermarket (competitive) outside of town (Woodbridge Road).	No Action.
33		FRAM13 FRAM14	General employment areas Incubator / start up business space	43 44	If traffic is to be reduced in the area then it is important that there are increased employment opportunities of all levels within the town.	No Action - FRAM 23 & 30
07	S2		Health	36	7.5 The surgery – it is not difficult to get appointments.	No Action.
10	S2		Health	36	7.5 At present the medical practice is good but any increase in population will put too much strain on it bearing in mind that Earl Soham is also included.	FRAM 9

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

28	S2	Health	7.5	36	We will never have a hospital in Fram so communications with Ipswich Hospital to be improved (car parking there is now extremely difficult). No NHS dentist in Fram.	No Action.
01	S2	Health and wellbeing	2.20	12	Concern for present medical practice needs to expand.	FRAM 9
01	S2	Health and wellbeing	2.24	13	Present footpath network needs to be preserved for walkers' enjoyment of countryside.	No Action.
25	S2	Health and wellbeing	2.2	12	We would like an N.H.S. dentist in Framlingham. We go to Woodbridge for N.H.S. dental treatment.	No Action.
41	S2	Health and wellbeing	2.22	13	SCDS has its leisure strategy - how are we going to ensure Fram benefits from this specifically? What are the plans for using CIL money for example?	Non Policy Action Plan and Framlingham. Via Infrastructure Priorities Plan.
11	S2	Health and wellbeing	2.20	12	No mention of mileage to Ipswich Hospital.	No Action.
12	FRAM19	Highway capacity at key road junctions	9.11	49	As traffic flows are already high, the additional flow due to any one development is unlikely to cause a "SEVERE IMPACT" On that basis you would have to accept the proposal. It may be better to require the Transport Assessment and then evaluate the implications. This could allow you to critically comment on the situation that is less SEVERE but still detrimental.	No Action.
19	S2	Highway capacity at key road junctions		49	P49 9.10 Pol 19 (+map on P50) - With an increased population Fairfield Road will be used more- the junction with Fore Street is already a difficult one. Should this be included?	Fairfield Road site not included in N.P. No Action.
01	S2	Highway pinchpoints	9.9	49	Road junctions: Very bad and becoming dangerous for Framlingham's many walkers.	Advised - Highways S.C.C.
11	S2	Highway pinchpoints	9.10	49	Pinch points more than just junctions - bad one in College Rd & bridge over river in Station Rd.	Advised - Highways S.C.C.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

14	S2		Highway pinchpoints	9.10	49	Page 49 - Highway pinchpoints - I think this should include the Station Road bridge.	Advised - Highways S.C.C.
15			Highway pinchpoints	9.10	49	9.10 & 9.11 - F.R. used as a "short cut" to Fore St & Station Rd. F.R. parking makes access to these roads difficult NOW. One regularly meets cars head on, as bends restrict visibility. It is a real danger to children accessing The Fens (to play and route to school). To consider adding to the traffic on F.R. (by building on a green site) would be utter madness - Framlingham is already virtually gridlocked at times, the roads too narrow to take the flow of heavy traffic.	No Action.
28	S2		Highway pinchpoints	9.10	49	Other pinch points in town - Badingham Road, Castle Street, Fore Street, Saxmundham Road. Full or partial bypass required around south of town.	Advised Highways S.C.C. No Action.
32	S2		Highway pinchpoints	9.11	49	Talks of problems with junctions along Station Rd. There are problems now! Any increase in traffic is going to present severe problems. The fact is Fram was never designed for major expansion.	Advised Highways S.C.C. No Action.
47	S2		Highway pinchpoints	9.10	49	Is it possible to make Mount Pleasant and Pembroke Road one way? Less congestion/less chance of accident for pedestrians.	No Action.
48	S2		Highway pinchpoints		47 50	Fig 9.1 This plan refers to walkways. Why do these walkways go through the three traffic pinch points identified in F9.2?	No Action.
52	S2	FRAM19	Highway pinchpoints	9.9 9.11	49	Mt Pleasant, College Rd, Well Close Sq, Bridge St, Fore St, & parts of Station Rd are narrow, built up cannot be widened & too narrow for cycling lanes. I do not see what can be done to accommodate a further 200 houses - 2-300 cars.	No Action.
22	S2		Housing	5	23	Oppose development - Land off Saxtead Road - Mount Pleasant, due to poor sewerage, increase in traffic.	No Action.
50	S2		Housing	5	23	As mentioned, should Fairfield Road go ahead, much of the NP's ideals will become unachievable overnight.	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

01	S2		Housing mix	5.12	24	Need for more bungalows or retirement dwellings.	FRAM2 & 3
11	S2		Housing mix	5.13	25	4 or more bedrooms - line 2	Plan corrected.
11	S2		Housing mix	5.14	25	Fig. 5.1 - Fram not too far out of line for such a small sample.	No Action.
14	S2	FRAM3	Housing mix		26	Is the 'Housing Mix' just for developments over 10 properties or all developments.	N.P. amended to show "greater than 10 units".
20	S2	FRAM3	Housing mix		26	Size of housing is good but no provision to restrict cost. How many will be affordable?	As S.C.D.C. policy - 33%.
26	S2	FRAM3	Housing mix		26	Remove last sentence stating 'An alternative.....'. If necessary put in the explanatory text.	No Action.
41	S2		Housing mix	5.13	25	Should this be '4 or more bedrooms' not dwellings'.	Plan corrected.
30	S2		Housing mix	5.12	24	Small new homes to facilitate downsizing is an excellent aim. How about some terracing?	No Action.
			Residential design	5.2.1	26		
10	S2		Housing requirements and strategy	5.4	23	The development in station Road is acceptable as it is a brown field site but should be of a mix of housing and clean factories. No further developments are acceptable in view of the lack of good road system. Poor employment potential, the fully utilised schools and health facilities, very poor parking.	No Action.
11	S2		Housing requirements and strategy	5.9	23	What is the basis for estimating the numbers of houses in areas quoted? They will be taken as minima by developers	Allocation requirements - No Action.
11	S2		Housing requirements and strategy	5.10	24	Land off Mount Pleasant is to W not S (see 12.2)	No Action.
14	S2		Housing requirements and strategy	5.6	23	Underline/ bold print 'minimum.'	Plan amended.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

14			Housing requirements and strategy	5.9	24	West of Framlingham Land off Vcyes Road/Brook Lane. I thought this was 14 houses not 15? S2 - Text box (top P.24)	No Action.
30	S2		Housing requirements and strategy	5.7	23	How is the 200 limit going to be enforced in the face of pressure from developers?	No Action.
41	S2		Housing requirements and strategy	5.3	23	How many houses have been delivered across the market towns between 2010-2016?	No Action.
41	S2		Housing requirements and strategy	5.4 5.5	23 23	If permission granted for Mount Pleasant & Fairfield Road, the figures proposed of 187-200 will already be out of date.	No Action.
47	S2		Housing requirements and strategy	5.9	23 24	8 houses at the Green Shed = possibly 24 more cars if 3 cars per household. Fore Street/Station Road junction will not cope. Need one-way system so top of Fore Street goes round to Fairfield Road. Cars coming up lower half of Fore Street (one-way) will stop to give way.	No Action.
11	S2		Land off Saxstead Road (opp Thomas Mills HS)	11.10	54	20 house plus car parking not possible. Compare with Kings Ave sizes.	Verified with land owner - No Action.
19	S2	FRAM22	Land off Saxstead Road (opp Thomas Mills HS)	11.8	54	P54/55 11.8 & Pol22 - The school buses cause much of the congestion. I know that in the past the school has considered making more space available for buses to pull in off the road. Perhaps this should be considered at the same time-with more school uses congestion will get worse.	No Action.
07	S2	FRAM28	Land off Victoria Mill Road	14.4	63	South Framlingham: LAND OFF VICTORIA MILL ROAD South Framlingham - 30 dwellings road too narrow and bends to (kill) on lights. The crescent for people living here - No parking for them now as it is not a <u>main road</u> .	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

01	S2	Land off Vyces Road / Brook Lane	12.9	59	Land off Vyces Road/Brook Lane: Excellent for Community Centre and housing.	No Action. (Provide information to Community Hall Working Group).
11	S2	Land off Vyces Road / Brook Lane	12.12	59	Don't cramp community centre space with more houses.	No Action. (Provide information to Community Hall Working Group).
13	S2	Land off Vyces Road / Brook Lane	12.11	59	Almshouses infer elderly people such developments would be for young families.	No Action. (Provide information to Community Hall Working Group).
19	S2	FRAM25 Land off Vyces Road / Brook Lane	12.1	59	P59 12.10 & pol 25 - See P40 above-concern about parking Additional 5 bungalows also scheduled off Vyces Road-pressure on parking grows all the time. This land should provide a play area or, at least, a free space for the families in the "Alms Houses."	No Action. (Provide information to Community Hall Working Group).
32	S2	Land off Vyces Road / Brook Lane	12.9	59	This land does not seem useful for anything other than walking the dog. It is not flat as stated but has a considerable slope. It seems boggy and is the home of grass snakes and slow worms. It is difficult to see how this could provide sufficient space for a community centre (Badingham Rd is much more suitable). 15 Houses plus extensive parking. The only reasonable access would be from Brook Lane. Vyces Rd is narrow, in practice one lane. The junction of Brook Lane and Vyces Rd is a potential accident spot as it is. The increased traffic would be hazardous and a nuisance to residents.	No Action. (Provide information to Community Hall Working Group).
45	S2	Land off Vyces Road / Brook Lane			C1-4 If a new community centre is built near Vyces Road/Brook Lane parking will be a major problem and lack of play space.	No Action. (Provide information to Community Hall Working Group).

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

46	S2		Land off Vyces Road / Brook Lane	12.9-12.12	59	I would agree with this proposal because of the Community Centre & affordable housing, although there would be a problem with traffic to and from the Community Centre.	No Action. (Provide information to Community Hall Working Group).
48	S2	FRAM12	Land off Vyces Road / Brook Lane	12.10	59	Who will own and run the centre on this site. Can the T.C. be certain that the facility will comply with Fram policy no 12.	No Action. (Provide information to Community Hall Working Group).
19	S2	FRAM30	Land off Woodbridge Road		64	P62 & P64 & pol 30 - Re commercial development on Woodbridge Road, see P43 above.	No Action. (See public consultation results).
36	S1	FRAM31	Land off Woodbridge Road	14.6	64	I disagree strongly with development on the Woodbridge Road. The Technology Centre is not full and the idea of Start-ups requiring such space is absurd. The only outcome of such development would mean Fairfield Road would be developed as infill. This would be very detrimental to Framlingham as both a residential town and a tourist attraction.	No Action. (See public consultation results).
41	S1	FRAM30	Land off Woodbridge Road		64	FRAM30 is good agricultural land. What about considering food security?	No Action.
42	S1	FRAM31	Land off Woodbridge Road	14.6	64	I don't think Woodbridge Road should be developed into an industrial estate. This would result in extra housing being built, which I believe would be very bad for Framlingham. The town should remain a beautiful tourist destination, not an ugly overdeveloped suburb.	No Action. (See public consultation results).
19	S2		Land south of Mount Pleasant	12.4	57	Preferably the footpath should continue to cross the area as it does now.	No Action .

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

19	S2	FRAM23	Land west of New Street	11.2	55	P55 11.1.12 & Pol 23 - I do not support the use of a hitherto untouched Greenfield agricultural site being used. Previously land to the north of Saxtead Road was earmarked and approved for commercial use. This field already has some commercial use, with a further plot set for development. This was a much better option. However, this is a better option than the Woodbridge Road proposal.	Land North of Saxtead Road withdrawn. FRAM23 clearly favoured by residents during consultation.
41		FRAM23 FRAM13	Land west of New Street General employment areas		55 43	FRAM23 got most votes & 2 employment sites either side of town would surely worsen traffic pinch points mentioned in the plan. What is B1, B2, & B8 development?	No Action. See Glossary of Terms.
38	S2	FRAM23 FRAM30	Land west of New Street Land off Woodbridge Road		55 64	Given the sensitive location of both proposed employment sites and their exciting open character, would it not be appropriate in terms of advising potential developers that all proposed buildings must be restricted to single storey.	
01	S2		Local green spaces	6.7	32	Local green spaces need to be preserved.	No Action.
10	S2		Local green spaces		32	Green Sites - Poor usage, Station Road field should encourage children and youths to play sports.	No Action.
20	S2	FRAM5	Low energy design and construction		27	Again Framlingham should be setting a benchmark so that housing development is organised and sustainable. A GREENER FRAM.	No Action.
20	S2	FRAM9	Medical provision		37	Additional medical facilities need to be mandatory not supported.	Not N.P. responsibility.
15	S1		National and local policy	1.11	5	This plan purports to give "direct power" to we locals to develop a shared vision for our much loved & respected neighbourhood. No-one in The Knoll favours the Fairfield Road development. My reason is based on practical grounds - see over	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

11	S2		Non-policy actions, delivery and plan review	16	66	Electric car charging points? Speed bumps not practical with volume of heavy commercial traffic.	Advise Parking Strategy Group and P.R. & Markets Committee.
41	S1		Non-policy actions, delivery and plan review	16	66	Definitely improved on previous draft plan. - Clearly set out, sites more clearly identified. - Possible omission in 16, page 66 in Health / Education & Leisure - Surely SCDC should be included in the 'Row' 'Improve access to leisure facilities'?	Plan corrected.
49	S2		Non-policy actions, delivery and plan review		16	The Non Policy Actions should be amended to include Culture & Heritage along the lines as follows: <u>Issue - Culture & Heritage</u> Improve access, participation and engagement with the historical heritage and cultural arts of the town. <u>Possible Actions</u> Conduct an audit of all cultural activities, where they take place and the suitability of the venues, how many participate, the type of participation involved (audience only or pro-active development). Explore the potential to invest and raise funding for a dedicated permanent cultural & heritage venue within the town centre.	Included in N.P. as requested.
11	S2		Objectives of the NP	3.5	20	What are "education for life principles"?	No Action.
28	S2		Objectives of the NP	3.4	20	Provide charging points (or make provision) for charging electric cars and plug in hybrids.	Advise Parking Strategy Group.
20		FRAM17 FRAM18	Pedestrian walkway routes / Cycling		48	Will contractor be made to provide these facilities?	No Action.
11	S2		Plan delivery and review	16.1	67	Neighbourhood plan needs to be overseen by Town Council.	N.P. amended.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

39	S2		Plan delivery and review	16.3	67	I am concerned about the idea that the voluntary /community sector may play a stronger role in the future. We have great organisations in this field but many are run by older people and they tell me that there doesn't seem to be sufficient interest from younger people (including middle-aged) so those groups may struggle in the future rather than be able to take on a greater role.	Advise P.R. & Markets Committee of concerns.
19	S2	VARIOUS	Policies 1-5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15*, 16*, 17, 18, 20, 21, reserve site policy (TMHS), 24#, 26-31			All good-particularly policy 5! Agree with the text of Pol 1, but see below for more detail. *= proceed with caution # = if you really have to.	No Action.
06	S2		Policy justification	4.5	21	How were physical limits boundary's (DM3-33) arrived at?	No Action. S.C.D.C. Core Strategy.
41	S2	FRAM13	Policy justification Vision for Framlingham	4.3 3.2	43 17	Unclear - FRAM30 (p.69) designated for employment land is surely outside the physical boundaries & opens up 'the possibility' of development adjacent to the boundary which is completely in open countryside. Why do we need 2 such large employment sites at this point?	No Action.
03	S2	FRAM7	Protection and maintenance of local green spaces		34	Surprised that the Cemetery is not included here.	No Action.
26	S2	FRAM7	Protection and maintenance of local green spaces		34	Green spaces like Edward's Farm Area should be re-instated and there should be an explanation on that some green spaces are protected already and so not included.	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

12	S2	FRAM6	Protection of important views	6.6	30	The stated views are very specific. There may be other views which cannot be quantified and it may be appropriate to broaden the requirement so that it could be considered for application where appropriate. Fairfield Road is relevant at present.	N.P. amended to include additional views.
19	S2	FRAM6	Protection of important views	6.2	28	P28 6.2 and P30 Pol 10 - Perhaps, after the Appeal hearing, the view from the Brick Lane footpath should be included here? It would back up what was said by the Suffolk Preservation Society and might serve to protect this site from development. This should then also feature on the map and in Policy 6.	N.P. amended to include additional views.
26	S2	FRAM6	Protection of important views		30	Increase number if views with detrimental impact, at the very least to include view from footpath off Fairfield Road, but better to be more comprehensive.	N.P. amended to include additional views.
28	S2		Protection of important views	6.1	28	Other important views not mentioned e.g. west down Castle Street & Double Street.	N.P. amended to include additional views.
34	S2		Protection of important views	6.6	30	Important Views: I have personally checked all the vantage points around Fram. The ONLY view of all three heritage sites is from Brick Lane across the field towards the town. This must be listed in important views and protected!	N.P. amended to include additional views.
36	S2		Protection of important views	6.6	30	Views from Brick Lane <u>must</u> be preserved.	N.P. amended to include additional views.
41	S2		Protection of important views	6.2	28	What about views to the Mere/Castle from the fields between Badingham Road & College Road & Fairfield Road - Coles Green? The Market Hill is already a conservation area so needs no additional protection. The sites above could be developed so need protecting.	N.P. amended to include additional views.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

42	S2		Protection of important views	6.6	30	Views from Brick Lane must be preserved	N.P. amended to include additional views.
43	S2		Protection of important views	6.2	28	No mention of the view from Brick Lane towards the town (which is on the Brownsord Way).	N.P. amended to include additional views.
26	S2	FRAM16	Provision of new tourist accommodation		45	Define last line 'setting or view of any listed building'.	No Action.
01	S2		Reserve site: Land to the rear of Thomas Mills HS	11.13	56	Land to the rear of Thomas Mills High School: Need entrance to school for buses/cars would ease Saxtead Road.	No Action.
39	S2		Reserve site: Land to the rear of Thomas Mills HS	11.14	56	If SCC and/or the number of children attracted to Framlingham new housing, point to a need for school places there could potentially be a need to move/extend schools. If this doesn't happen in the 5 year period before renew could this land be grabbed for housing?	No Action.
01	S2		Residential design	5.18	26	Quality of design so important not to spoil the present charm of Framlingham.	No Action.
19	S2		Residential design	5.18	26	Much agree with this. Avoid faceless identikit development!	No Action.
36	S2		Residential design	5.17	26	Some requirement should be made to "individualise" housing to Framlingham.	No Action.
36	S2		Residential design	5.22	27	Stock "architectural" solutions are inappropriate.	No Action.
42	S2		Residential design	5.17 5.22	26 27	Housing design should have requirement to be made individual. Stock architectural solutions would not be right for Framlingham.	No Action.
34	s2		Residential design	5.17 5.22	26 27	Housing Design:- I feel it is essential that pressure is brought on developers to design for Fram. Not supply "off the shelf" designs we see in Sax and Wickham Market.	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

35	S2	FRAM30	South Framlingham	14	62	My concern is that if the housing development gets approval for Fairfield Road, there will be a push by developers to infill the remaining space to the east of Fairfield Road.	No Action.
43	S2		South Framlingham	14.3	62	I am not happy with this. At the moment all the "business" premises are on the left & any development on the right will spoil the present open approach to Framlingham.	No Action.
50	S2		South Framlingham	14	62	As in 8. above the current employment area in Woodbridge Road pays lip service to any landscaping requirements - 3 or four small trees, with no real effort to conceal anything from the road. Is this how FRAM30 will be allowed to mar the town entrance?	Town Council reference.
52	S2	FRAM26	The Green Shed, Fore Street	13.4	61	The green shed site would be an excellent location for 'retirement flats'. Rental or purchase.	No Action - FRAM26
06	S2		The local economy	2.30	14	Second sentence insert 'on'	Plan corrected.
11	S2		The local economy	2.29	14	The tourism on offer includes Framlingham Castle.	No action.
22	S2		The local economy	12	57	Main employers in Fram are schools - teachers and support services. Town is a centre for education.	No action.
23	S2		The local economy	2.32	15	Vyces Road - 'affordable' (whatever is 'affordable') on this condition homes will be allocated to residents of Framlingham.	Plan amended.
25	S2		The local economy	2.32	15	Market deserves a mention as: retail, tourism attraction and in relation to traffic management.	Non Policy Actions.
28	S2		The local economy	2.32	15	We like and use the shops here, but find the Co-op expensive. An Aldi or Lidl would be appreciated.	No Action.
30	S2		The local economy	2.30	14	The list of local services (retail) assumes that all these businesses are O.K. Why do people travel outside for good shopping, dentists, clothing, building supplies etc?!!	No Action.
44	S2		The old Gas Works site, College Road	15.3	65	The rise of B&B may increase holiday accommodation in the coming years. To make sure the design of the units to be in keeping with the old properties on either side	FRAM31 amended.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

11	S2		The profile of Framlingham today	2.14	10	Last sentence should start "The number of..."	Plan corrected.
26	S2		The profile of Framlingham today	2.11	9	I do not agree that it has an above average no. of people aged 84 or more - or certainly not enough to comment on. What it does show is the below average number of people in the 25-64 age bands. This indicates that young people are moving out of Framlingham and not returning.	Agreed - comment noted.
26	S2		The profile of Framlingham today	2.14 2.15	10 11	Found the section on employment very confusing. Should be more specific as to what the employment opportunities are currently and how they should be improved.	No Action - future study.
41	S2		The profile of Framlingham today	2.15	11	Does the 58% of people include people whose business is registered at home but who travel out of town every day? E.g. builders, plumbers.	No Action.
22	S2		Thomas Mills high school area	11	53	Sir Robert Hitcham to the same site of Thomas Mills resulting in <u>high levels of air pollution (concentration in one area)</u> traffic chaos.	No Action.
28	S2		Thomas Mills high school area	11.3	53	Sports facilities to be combined with proposed community centre to make both more viable. A standalone centre of 200 seats would not receive a lot of use.	No Action - FRAM12
01	S2		Transport	9	46	Transport and parking of significant concern.	Non Policy Actions.
22	S2		Transport	9	46	What steps are you taking to encourage cycling & walking. The naivety of thinking 'little' footpaths will encourage walking is ludicrous. So many residents are still using their cars for these small journeys.	Non Policy Actions.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

23	S2	Transport		General Improving public transport will not do much to ease traffic congestion, largely a function of population and intensity of business use. Radical measures to improve parking on fringes of town, in this towns walking distance of centre are key. Provision of off road, free parking for residents of Fore Street, to make it two-way is a must to relieve congestion. Speed bumps not really necessary, (no one speeds much even on periphery.) Current warning signs good enough. Is it possible to double deck the Co-op car park and others?	See Non Policy Actions.
44	S2	Transport	9	46 Transport & Movement There seems to be no mention of public transport improvement more buses etc . Not everyone can walk or ride a bike!	See Non Policy Actions.
47	S2	Transport	9.2	46 We need resident parking permits and if the lower half of Fore Street was made one-way, uphill one side could be used for residents parking.	See Non Policy Actions.
50	S2	Transport	9	46 With no guarantee of any funds from developers ever being allocated to Fram, how will the road safety /speeding / walking plans ever be achieved? This is a crucial issue for many residents.	See Non Policy Actions.
01	S2	Travel and transport	2.35	15 Transport by bus inadequate especially for appointments at hospital.	No Action.
11	S2	Travel and transport	2.35	15 No link to nearest alternative bank & supermarket at Saxmundham.	No Action.
25	S2	Travel and transport	2.34	15 Walking to Doe's is very dangerous as there is no footpath.	See Non Policy Actions.
28	S2	Travel and transport	2.33	15 Cycling & walking not generally safe. Provide ring road to direct main traffic away from the town centre. This is probably our only chance for this!	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

29	S2		Travel and transport	2.35	15	Our largest nearby town is <u>Woodbridge</u> with <u>few</u> direct services and none at weekends. On the other hand there is almost an <u>hourly</u> service to and from <u>Ipswich</u> , including Saturdays, with easy transfer to the X5 bus to the hospital (which I frequently use).	No Action.
28	S2		Vision for Framlingham	3.2	17	Vision for Fram is mediocre, why not lead (see my initial comments).	No Action.
49			Vision for Framlingham	3.20	17	The Vision Statement should be amended to include a statement on Culture & Heritage along the lines as follows: The cultural heritage of the community is enhanced by the support of venues to host arts, media, science, historical and environmental events, displays and archives involving local participation, thereby creating a memory and knowledge base and resource for future generations.	Referred to P.R. & Markets Committee of T.C.
06	S1		Vision Statement		19	Question: is not clear to me whether the 'Vision' for Framlingham derives from Suffolk District Costal (Core Strategy, policy SP23) or the Town Council?	No Action.
01	S2		Walking and cycling	9.4	46	Walking and cycling provision needed to improve existing.	See Non Policy Actions.
06	S2		Walking and cycling	9.3	46	Walking and Cycling - is it possible to walk to Wickham Market Station? • Facilitating less congestion at busy times by encouraging children walking to and from school and people walking to the station and shops rather than 'jumping in the car' for a short journey.	Plan amended. See Non Policy Actions.
11	S2		Walking and cycling	9.3	46	Walking to "station"?	Plan amended.
15	S2		Walking and cycling	9.3	46	Fairfield Road is a problem to walk as vehicles come too close to the (incomplete) path.	No Action.
19	S2		Walking and cycling	9.3	46	Walking to the station?	Plan amended.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

19	S2		Walking and cycling	9.6	48	Is there a guarantee of any CIL money coming into Framlingham?	No Action.
26	S2		Walking and cycling		47	Fig. 9.1 Walking Routes... Walkways 'increase number to go through centre of town and to established residential developments.'	Non Policy Actions.
28	S2		Walking and cycling	9.3	46	Cyclists and electric buggy users are very dangerous to elderly pedestrians.	No Action.
32	S2		Walking and cycling	9.3	46	Appears to be suggesting people should walk to the Station in Wickham Market!:	Plan amended.
33			Walking and cycling	9.3	46	Innovative & imaginative ways should be sort to encourage people to not use their cars at every opportunity Encouragement should be given to local children to walk or cycle to & from school.	Non Policy Actions.
43	S2		Walking and cycling	9.3	46	IS THIS AN ERROR ie people walking to the station or do you mean the pub?	Plan amended.
47	S2		Walking and cycling	9.3	46	An accident is waiting to happen at the Saxtead Road/College Road junction where Thomas Mills High School children cross. Near miss last week! Need a pedestrian crossing or roundabout + pedestrian crossing.	No Action.
48	S2		Walking and cycling	9.3	46	Improvements for cyclists and walkers are needed . Where are the plans for this. Please consult "Sustrans" and get an expert in probably no cost.	Action completed.
06	S2		Waste management and energy efficiency	2.37	15	Has the Town Council considered that there may only be 50 solar-voltaic (PV) arrays in Town because of contractual bans stipulated by some developers in the first 01-10 years of completion of their new build sites?	Advise T.C. Planning Committee.
28	S2		Waste management and energy efficiency	2.36	15	Listed buildings should be given expert advice to improve energy efficiency without spoiling the look of the building and the town.	No Action.
47			West Framlingham	12.1	57	Mount Pleasant may be needed as a route through/around if ring road considered. Keep free from housing please!	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

02					As the road system in Framlingham is already overcrowded, if more houses were to be built it would make the problem worse.	Response refers to previous consultation document: General No Action.
02					I cannot see - with more houses - that there would be a "thriving centre", as every new shop at the moment is either a Coffee House or gift shop, with nothing really practicable.	Response refers to previous consultation document: The Way forward - Page 11
02					I cannot see how the surgery would manage with hundreds of new people from new homes, when there is a national shortage of Doctors.	Response refers to previous consultation document: Health
02					New buildings would certainly be needed for many new pupils in all schools, so where is the money coming from.	Response refers to previous consultation document: Education
02					People do not more to a new area unless they know there is Employment for them, and Framlingham is lacking such places. Ipswich is expensive to get to, being the cost of petrol and car parking. Bus services already being cut down.	Response refers to previous consultation document: Health
03	S1				No reference made anywhere to the Station Road site owned by Hopkins.	Station Road Site had received full planning in 2012 / amended in 2014 and housing numbers are included in calculating future housing allocation. No Action.
05	S1				I object very strongly to any additional development, other than that proposed in this document.	No Action.
06	S1				The pre-submission draft as presented makes it clearer for readers to see how Town Council Plans fit with the wider strategic view set by central government and being implemented by Suffolk District Coastal as the local planning authority.	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

06	S2					Glossary of Terms added.
08	S1				<p>Suggest including a 'Glossary of terms' for acronyms and phrases e.g. paragraphs: 9.14 FRAM20: - Use Class 3 11.12 FRAM23: - B-class employment Page 56 para 11.13 begins 'As was noted at the start of Section 13,' ... Section 13 is about East Framlingham.</p>	No Action.
09	S1				<p>Despite the huge effort that has gone onto this plan, I am not convinced that it really has much significance when it comes to future planning applications. It seems to me that Neighbourhood Plans can be overruled easily and any land recommended for development will be quickly built over. The whole process is governed by the developer's assessment of how much money they can make and how long it will take. The initiative is with the developers NOT with the planning authorities at any level. Sadly useful statement though it is, it does not protect Framlingham from over development. Therefore it's useless to pretend that it does.</p>	Affordable housing included at S.C.D.C. policy levels. See Section 16.
10	S1				<p>Doesn't go far enough. Affordable housing needed. Public transport inadequate. Infrastructure inadequate. Are the council going to take responsibility for the chaos afterwards.</p>	See Section 16.
10	S2				<p>The main problem in Framlingham is the poor infrastructure which sensibly does not allow any further building developments. The road system is poor and cannot easily be rectified.</p>	No Action.
					Community Organisation - In general good and any increase welcome.	

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

10			42	Employment - Very poor and mainly outside the town.	Employment Sites chosen by Public Consultation. FRAM13 & 14 No Action.
11	S1			1. Planning approval already given to Hopkins Homes and Persimmon for 195 house plus risk of Taylor Wimpey's 160 houses, so plan must show how it will accommodate new pupils, new patients and expanded services of all sorts in the next 5 years.	Taylor Wimpey 160 houses are not included in the N.P.
11	S1			2. Will Fram Council play a leading role?	No Action.
11	S1			3. The ideals for Framlingham are excellent. To be effective the plan will need to be more precise in defining targets and how they are to be carried out.	See Section 16.
11				4. In the light of the recent planning appeals it is clear that the plan will be a major reference for any future proposals and the statements made must be based on facts.	No Action.
12	S1			As a vision for the future, it will be good to see the plan in place, as a basis for reviewing planning matters.	No Action.
13	S1			No mention of bridge in Station Road. With ninety nine houses and (150 cars?) being built and increasing HGV traffic, this needs to be wide enough to accommodate two way passage.	Discussed with S.C.C. Highways, they do not agree that bridge widening is necessary at this stage or in the foreseeable future.
14	S1			Congratulations to John, James, Kevin & Chris. I think you have produced a good/informative document. I concur with the comments above re the bridge.	No Action. See Above.
16	S2			We agree with what you have proposed so far.	No Action.
17	S1			The document is very well presented giving a clear picture of the town as it is now and a structured well thought out vision for the future development. Thank you to all who have worked so hard to produce this plan.	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

18	S1				As a resident of Framlingham having 163 housing at Fairfield Road and about 100 at Mount Pleasant would put the town's infrastructure over loaded. The Doctors surgery is experiencing a great deal of pressure as it is now. I have had to wait 2 weeks for an appointment without the 95-100 houses on Station Road now being built, plus the 14 or more in Brook Lane with only one 1 bus an hour to Ipswich and not much industry in the town the roads are already under siege only one supermarket. I don't like to think of the sewerage. Schools and parking are already overloaded. Let's keep Framlingham a nice place for tourists to come with views over a beautiful town's heritage church, castle college and tea shops to spend their money, instead of driving through.	163 houses not included in the N.P. Non Policy Action Plan. (See Section 16.)
18	S2				Please build on brown sites & not the green belt.	No Action.
18	S2				Parking is a problem now. Residents now have to park in and around the roads, also tourists.	Parking Strategy - Working Group formed to look into this. (See Section 16.)
18					Framlingham is a lovely small town. Let's keep it that way; not an overspill for Ipswich.	No Action.
18	S2				The doctor's surgery not only caters for the town. It also covers local villages.	No Action.
19	S1				Overall I think the NP is looking good. I have detailed areas where I have concerns on the next sheet. A few proof reading comments (ok yes I'm a pedant...)	See her section 1 general comment sheet.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

20				<p>In general I agree with a sustained development of Fram but there appears to be little provision for residents of Framlingham on lower incomes. The development of Fram should consider the effects on Fram of pushing local workers out to more affordable locations which in turn adds to the traffic problem. This development opportunity should not be a gold rush or greedy developers. Fram needs to hang on to the youth and not become another Southwold/Aldeburgh.</p>	<p>The provision of affordable housing is maximised in the plan and in the case of Vyces Road we have catered for Framlingham's' needs in particular. The plan also provides for an increase of smaller dwellings in the policy <u>FRAM3</u>.</p>
21	S1			<p>Having read the consultation document, I should like to say thank you to all those who were involved for the time care and attention to detail that has been given to preparing this plan. I feel that this has been achieved with due consideration to all interested parties, both present and future. I support the changes outlined and hope that the same level of care will be taken regarding future development within the town, particularly the need to balance housing supply with the limitations of the infrastructure. In this respect, I do have reservations regarding the size and number of houses proposed for the Fairfield Road site, but I also appreciate a definite need for affordable housing particularly in the 25.44 age group. Ideally, I should also like to see some provision for new homes being protected from "buy to let" speculation.</p>	No Action.
22	S1			<p>The town plan does not demonstrate a holistic approach. Language used 'recommend', 'need', 'require' is too woolly. Lacks vision and creativity. Young people of Framlingham are being let down. -We will gradually lose our 'special town'.</p>	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

24	S1					A comprehensive plan which I consider reflects the views of the residents and the situation of the town. Very pleased that my main concerns i.e. small housing for ageing population and the need for a community hall are featured.	No Action.
26	S1					This version is an improvement on the previous versions, but could be more specific and suggest more ambitious targets, especially for non-housing issues, in particular employment. The enthusiasm of land-owners to sell to housing developers and the apparent invincibility of national housing developers and their ability to override the wishes of the Town Council and local residents indicates that the plan should give no leeway for them to renege on their responsibilities to provide adequate infrastructure via SCDC & County Council. Framlingham should aim to be a thriving market town, rather than a commuter town with a market. Insufficient attention has been given to promoting biodiversity and increasing green spaces & conserving agricultural land. Since there are fewer people in the 25-64 age group than expected, find out whether school leavers intend to return in due course and if not, why not. Develop a policy to encourage young people to want to move into the area. Encourage projects to secure property that young people can afford to buy.	See FRAM2 / FRAM3 / FRAM4 and FRAM14
27	S1					No comments	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

28	S1				<p>In the past, Fram. was the centre of the surrounding area providing services (& jobs) not obtainable in the small settlements. This should be the main objective in the new plan.</p> <p>Framlingham should be a leader in utilising energy saving etc. techniques and landscaping making new developments pleasant place to live in and visit to provide an example to the rest of the country. We will not get another chance! Current developments are all poorly planned, poor quality and very mediocre. We do not want estates to mimic the new ones in Wickham Market and Saxmundham.</p> <p>Visit Letchworth and Bourneville to see how it was done in the past!! WE CARE!!</p>	Section 16 and FRAM3, 4 and 5.
28	S1				<p>Congratulations on producing a good plan only lacking in better ideas.</p>	No Action.
30	S1				<p>Obviously a very thoughtful Plan but I fear there is a large element of wishful thinking in it. However, no harm in wishing.</p>	No Action.
30	S2				<p>"Development designed to protect and enrich". I hope this laudable ambition will be borne in mind as the onslaught of wealthy developers is felt.</p>	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

31	S1			<p>Not sure enough stated and firmly enough about our heritage & to keep historic built environment as ultimately most important. Need Heritage in Objectives & emphasise protection of historic built environment. We must emphasise "views" as most important in new development & emphasise designs to preserve our character. Keep and show our residential "boundaries" Where are "non designated" heritage assets? I understand "no large" developments therefore I do not understand why accept Mount Pleasant? Need more emphasis on "no" large developments as it is in keeping with our ancient character. Need phasing a few a year.</p>	<p>N.P. Amended. See FRAM2 Phasing is not a condition we can place on development, 'the market' will decide.</p>
32	S1			<p>Whatever the gloss that is put on any new development it will be very detrimental to the quality of life of the existing population and for the existing services such as medical and educational. Currently the roads are dangerous and overcrowded. Public transport is non-existent, parking on certain days impossible. It should be born in mind that many old people are obliged to drive into Fram for shopping, banking etc. and are not capable of walking or cycling. On other matters I think it is a matter of serious concern that there is no street lighting at night. No police presence, and there is a possibility of losing the Bank.</p>	<p>Public Transport is included in the Non Policy Action Plan for the T.C. See Section 16. No Action, but Comments passed on to F.T.C.</p>
32	S2			<p>Having made what I am sure will be considered as negative comments, I would like to say that it is obvious a huge amount of work has gone in to this and those responsible should be thanked very warmly.</p>	<p>No Action.</p>

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

33	S1				<p>Having read the plan carefully it is in my opinion a very well balanced document. It would seem to me to deal with the demand that more houses are built in Framlingham sensitively and sensibly, emphasising the need for affordable family homes of an average size. The declining number of school aged children living in Framlingham and the surrounding area villages is having an impact on both the primary and secondary schools. At present at TMHS considerably more than 50% of students are out of catchment. Whilst they are extremely welcome this does have a huge impact on traffic in the town at the beginning and end of the school day.</p>	No Action.
34	S1				<p>Framlingham is a unique town and must be protected from inappropriate and over development. The town should be developed sensitively and sustainably. Tourism is an important part of the local economy-tourists visit Fram because of its unique character-do not let that be destroyed. I not that Fairfield Rod is NOT in the NP-nor should it ever be! I am seriously concerned that Woodbridge Road (north side) is earmarked for Employment Development. It should not: it is an open gate to developers wanting to "infill" between Woodbridge Road - all the way up Fairfield Road to the town. The technology centre is NOT full. I doubt that start-ups would flock to Woodbridge Road. Much better to keep costs down and work from home. I did!</p>	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

35	S1				<p>Much work has obviously been put into this plan which I feel addresses many issues facing "Fram" over the coming years. I approve.</p> <p>Having attended the recent appeals at Melton re. new housing my only reservation is that this good work will be undone if all the current proposed building goes ahead.</p> <p>Let's hope that some of the "CIL" Levy comes back to Framlingham.</p>	No Action.
37	S1				<p>I have read the town plan and agree with its proposals. I have nothing I wish to add to it except to say that I am hugely impressed with it.</p> <p>The amount of work and time the council members must have put into its creation must have been enormous. Thank you all very much for all you have done on behalf of all of us residents of the town. Very well done, an excellent job of work.</p> <p>Very best wishes and thank you again.</p>	No Action.
38	S2			<p>8 18 37 47</p>	<p>A few typos which you may now have now picked up!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2.5 3rd line: Hitcham's Almshouses - 3.3 Neighbourhood Plan in third line - POLICY FRAM9: The provision of additional... - Figure 9.1 - Legend FRAM23: Framlingham 	Plan corrected.
39	S1				<p>The Plan is comprehensive and reads well.</p> <p>I hope that everyone signs up to it / most of it, but I don't know how this will happen!</p> <p>Sure things seem a bit vague but then we don't know what the future holds, so it's always difficult.</p> <p>Thank you to those who have worked on this. I may not 100% agree with all of it, but I appreciate how complex and difficult it must have been to write it. Not everyone will like all of it but that's real life - we just need the best fit we can get for the best future for Fram.</p>	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

40	S1				<p>Searching for a home in Framlingham for 1 year! The shock of the new may be healthy and exciting if sensibly paced. Too much too soon may destabilise a community. As a former resident of Merton (Sth London) I was demoralised by bad planning resulting in: Bursting schools, full car parks, traffic jams, vacant high street buildings, stressed hospitals, aesthetic decline and loss of community morale. Social decline.</p>	No Action.
40	S1				<p>Continued from above... I have studied Settlement & Patterns of how communities fit their physical environment (BA Hons London). As a school governor (5 yrs High & Pri.sch) I have been party to enforced building of classrooms in schools previously defined as having no more space. These pressures coalesce and trickle through communities manifesting in dysfunction and disillusion. Fram is so perfectly balanced and if the equilibrium of population needs and infrastructure are compromised I feel theirs will be at a loss, at all levels, except a few individuals connected to the bidding industry. WE need to respect and protect the character that is Framlingham. How will development impact the aesthetic offer that keeps Fram on the tourist map? If parking is compromised will there be a commercial decline? Does the increase in Kesgrave housing units reduce pressure on Fram? Who and from where will the new residents be? Why dilute the quality that is Framlingham.</p>	No Action.
40	S2				<p>Apologies. No time. Came late to this issue!</p>	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

41	S2	FRAM17	48	Great idea to have a crossing (FRAM24:) & encourage developers to improve footpaths but pavements/walking routes are already generally good - it is volume of traffic that causes pedestrians problems. How about a crossing at the primary school as the college has one?	Advise R of Way / Highways Committee.
43	S1			It will be good to have campsite facilities- often asked for by visitors? Near to the TMHS or top end of Victoria Mill Road.	No Action.
44	S1			I appreciate a lot of hard work has gone into the preparation of the Plan. As a long time resident of Framlingham, with a gap of a few years. I wished that Framlingham, stayed the same apart from the infill development and building on brownfield sites. Not large estates which will have a huge impact on the quality of life of residents of Framlingham.	No Action.
44	S2			Town Centre Employment & Tourism The town centre and the market is very attractive. Why does it need improving? I am convinced that tourism will drop if tourists cannot find anywhere to park their cars.	Parking Strategy, including Tourist / Visitor Parking being actioned in the N.P. - see Section 16.
45	S1			In general the plan looks good. I appreciate the amount of work that has gone into it. A little proof reading would have made it even clearer and more professional. I found the letter from the Suffolk Preservation Society useful and endorse their suggestion that the historic built environment should be mentioned specifically as we as protected. Their concern re views is helpful and I would like to add the view of the castle from New Road. The view of the college from Tanyard Court and The Elms and the view of the town from Brick Lane. We do not want to lose any of these.	N. Plan amended.
45	S2		1-11	All fine - if we can control them. A need for 1 or 2 bedroom homes. Affordable homes is paramount.	FRAM2 & 3

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

45	S2					1-4 Do we need an umbrella organisation-we already have Fram Residents' Assoc? We do need to support our overloaded surgery.	No Action - FRAM9
45	S2					LE1,2 Yes, let's use our brownfield sites wherever possible.	No Action
45	S2					AP5,6,7,8 Do we really need another grocery store? I don't.	No Action
45	S2					T1,2,3, New developments <u>must</u> contribute to alleviating the problems they cause e.g. congestion, parking etc. And drains!	No Action
45	S2					AP9 Public transport e.g. to station and elsewhere must be improved.	Non Policy Action Plan - see Section 16..
45	S2					R1 I support more walkways and cycle paths from new developments.	POLICY FRAM17 & 18
45	S2					AP10,11,12 Developers should be specific about nature of new jobs they bring. New housing should be energy efficient. We need more re-cycling facilities.	FRAM5 and Section 16.
45	S2					G1 Green space must be preserved.	FRAM7
45	S2					AP12 When they're gone, they're gone!	AP12? No such reference?
45	S2					I wish you luck working with other levels of government in preserving and enhancing our beloved town.	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

46	S1					<p>If there are to be more housing projects in the town, then the infrastructure, i.e. food shops, doctors surgery and school places have to be greatly enlarged & put in place before any said housing is built.</p>	Town infrastructure problems are widely recognised. See section 16.
47	S1					<p>If housing requirement was instigated by EU and if we came out of EU in June, will we still be required to build unnecessarily? Don't agree that we need to build a Community Centre if primary school is being moved. Would provide enough space for community activities/marquee on playing field. We desperately need residents parking. We need a ring road of some sort. How many market towns have combines driving through the centre of their towns?! Need lorries diverted out of town which are purely through-traffic. Need a turn off for school buses at Thomas Mills. Not there yet!!</p>	No Action.
48	S1					<p>This plan is out of date! No mention is made of the 150 houses that could be built on the sports club site within 5 years! Full community facilities should be the aim behind the T.M.H.S. including caravan/camping, community hall and sports club. Surely this should have a block for name and address.</p>	<p>Sports Club Site not included in the plan at this stage. No Action. Included on response sheet.</p>
50						<p>In general I agree with much of the N.P. However, should the Fairfield Road development go ahead much the plan will become redundant before it comes into being. The Council's lack of foresight in this area undermines all the good work carried out.</p>	No Action.

FRAMLINGHAM N.P. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) - PUBLIC RESPONSE ANALYSIS

51					<p>My overall thoughts of the future plans for this town are good people need houses and schools but only where possible on brown field sites. There should be a mix of houses where the older generation are happy to downsize and leave the family home to enable families to bring up their families. I thank the person or persons' for producing this document and making it clear the plans intended for Fram.</p>	FRAM2,3,4&5
52	S1				<p>This is a most excellent document and I applaud the team for their work. I am concerned that the Hopkins Homes development in Station Rd has escaped the rigors of the Neighbourhood Plan (2016) and they have been allowed to build without referring to community needs - 1&2 bed dwellings & affordable housing. Is there any way SCDC and Fram Town Council & Fram Residents Association can negotiate some compensation from them for say a community centre. After all they (HH) negotiated dropping affordable housing by means of an appeal to the Secretary of State. Surely a retrospective claim on behalf of our community is not unreasonable. I assume HH will build mostly 4&5 bed houses as that is where the maximum profit lies.</p>	<p>Permission granted 4 years ago. No Action.</p>
52	S2				<p>I see no referencing to green belt farming land in Fairfield Road. I would hate to see this site a mass of houses.</p>	

Your Ref:
Our Ref:
Date: 13 May 2016
Enquiries to: James Cutting
Tel: 01473 264803
Email: james.cutting@suffolk.gov.uk



Framlingham Town Council,
10 Riverside,
Framlingham
Suffolk
IP13 9AG

Dear Sir or Madam,

Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for inviting Suffolk County Council to review and respond to the Neighbourhood Plan. There are several areas which the County Council will be partners in delivering the vision outlined in the Plan. This includes, for example, improvements to the town centre as the highway authority. The neighbourhood plan recognises the need for it to be a flexible working document, with this in mind, the Plan is a positive basis to take various projects forward.

The Vision extends the plan period from that in Suffolk Coastal's Core Strategy, 2027 to 2031. A clearer statement to how the neighbourhood plan has factored in the core strategy's requirements and the extended timescale would assist comprehending the scale of growth proposed. The maps showing proposed development could be more clearly labelled; the Station Road development is shown on with other allocated sites but is not the proposals map.

The main growth-related components of the Neighbourhood Plan are:

- Allocation of sites for 200 homes, and
- Allocation of two sites for employment (2.8ha and 3.7ha).

Since publication, there have been two appeals determined:

- 168 homes on land at Fairfield Road (SCDC ref: DC/14/2747/FUL), and
- 100 home on and at Mount Pleasant (SCDC ref: DC/14/2276/FUL) FRAM24.

The site at Mount Pleasant road has since received planning permission. The impacts of these sites have been reviewed by the County Council and comments have been provided in the context of the Neighbourhood Plan coming forward.

- STATION ROAD IS NOT PART OF THE FNP SITE ALLOCATIONS – PLANNING WAS GRANTED PREVIOUS TO FNP SO NOT ON PROPOSALS MAP
- 168 SHOULD READ 163 AT FAIRFIELD ROAD – APPROVED AT
- 100 ON MOUNT PLEASANT –REFUSED AT APPEAL IN FAVOUR OF 95 INCLUDED IN FNP SITE ALLOCATIONS.

Economic Development

The plan notes that 58% of residents live and work with the area and that there is net-out commuting, with the majority towards Ipswich. The role of small-scale businesses and the service sector, including tourism, is reviewed. The town's economic role is reflected in the vision and the emphasis extending the range of employment within walking/cycling distance is a welcome addition.

The aims of Policy FRAM14 (Incubator/Start-up business space) are worthy and are enabling. The county council's experience is that adequate grow-on space is also needed. With this in mind, the allocation of land for employment (FRAM23 and FRAM30) is a positive step. The Town Council might also be interested in the results of the latest needs assessment for the wider Ipswich area. This is available through, for example, Waveney District Council's website.¹ In summary, this highlights a net land requirement for Suffolk Coastal of 36.4ha between 2011 and 2031 and the opportunities to local economy.

The emphasis of tourism proposals needing to demonstrate an economic benefit in policy FRAM15 might not be necessary given such developments, by their very nature will have economic benefits.

- NO ACTION NECESSARY OTHER THAN FOLLOW UP 'NEEDS ASSESSMENT'

Transport

The peak periods of travel to work and during the weekends and summer months are identified. In common with other rural towns and villages, the issue of lorries and commercial vehicles is raised as a local concern.

- NO ACTION NECESSARY

Walking and Cycling

The emphasis on the pedestrian walkway routes in FRAM17 is welcomed as is the recognition that funds from the Community Infrastructure Levy could be used.

Cycling is a strong element of the plan, particularly FRAM18, which seeks to improve the provision of cycling infrastructure by way of new dedicated routes and cycle racks. Any routes will need to be carefully considered and, at present, no proposals are being programmed through the Local Transport Plan.

- NO ACTION NECESSARY

Public Transport

The document refers to an "inadequate" provision of public transport but does not identify the level of demand to other locations and how this fits with an overall strategy. The vision seeks to re-establish the town as a local transport hub, which is understandable. The County Council's aims to improving the commercial viability of services and the integration of community bus services can be linked to the non-policy actions outlined in the delivery plan.

- NO ACTION NECESSARY

¹ <http://www.waveney.gov.uk/site/scripts/download.php?fileID=7108>

Traffic

The provisions in FRAM19, for the cumulative impact of transport to be considered in transport assessments is welcome and provides Suffolk County Council, as highway authority, a degree of certainty that the impacts of the plan can be addressed. There are two aspects in which this policy could be improved.

The identification of the junctions, which have been identified through traffic surveys, should not exclude the need to examine the impact of developments at other junctions. The identification of affected junctions is normally part of scoping transport assessments. The county council, as highway authority, is supportive of Policy FRAM19 on the understanding that it adds weight to the case for including these three junctions when assessing traffic impacts rather than excluding the need to consider other junctions.

The need for a transport assessment might be too onerous for some of the smaller allocated sites, where a Transport Statement would be sufficient. Secondly, in order to consider cumulative impacts, any assessment or statement will need to provide a common methodologies that relate to previous assessments/statements. Such a requirement can be set out in the supporting text.

The reference to the Suffolk Advisory Parking Guidance in policy FRAM20 is welcome as this provides a clear policy linkage to the development plan. Suffolk's parking guidance covers a wider range of development than housing. For example, as written, the policy would not apply to employment development and a lack of spaces in employment sites can result in on-road parking. Parking provision also has linkages to the Building for Life criteria.

- REWORD POLICY FRAM19 TO *NOT EXCLUDE* THE NEED TO CONSIDER OTHER ROAD JUNCTIONS THAN THE THREE MENTIONED.
- TRANSPORT ASSESSMENTS – NEED FOR SUPPORTING TEXT TO EXPRESS THE NEED FOR COMMON METHODOLOGY THAT RELATES TO PREVIOUS ASSESSMENTS.
- RE PARKING GUIDANCE - POLICY FRAM 20, PREVIOUSLY AMENDED TO INCLUDE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES.

Children and Young People – Education

General

The plan notes an increase in children aged 0-15 and the current provision of pre-school, primary and secondary education as reported by the schools.

Pre-school

Whilst there is a linkage to FRAM8 (Education Provision) and, potentially FRAM12 (Community Centres/Facilities), there should be more explicit reference to the providers of early years education in section 7.

In Framlingham, there are three Early Years providers (a School Nursery, a Childminder and a private day nursery) offering at total 108 places. Currently, there are only 18 spaces available. The requirements in relation to the permitted and appeal sites have already been addressed. In addressing any shortfall in provision through expansion of existing facilities, the county council would be seeking the use of funds arising from the Community Infrastructure Levy which flow to the district and parish councils.

The current statutory framework requires that the County Council funds the provision of 15 hours per week free childcare for every 3 or 4 year old, and eligible 2 year olds. The Government is introducing legislation to double the number of hours free childcare to 30. It is not yet clear what effect this will have on the availability of places, but it is expected to significantly increase demand even without new housing being built.

Primary

Suffolk County Council's response to Suffolk Coastal's plan in December 2015, the County Council highlighted that Sir Robert Hitcham Primary School is approaching its total capacity. Following discussions with the school, the County Council believes that the school can be expanded to create an additional places. The current (Version 2.1) Education and Learning Infrastructure Plan states:

“Sir Robert Hitchams CEVC Primary School to be expanded now that site solution has been found and agreed.”

During the consideration of the appeal for Mount Pleasant site (DC/14/2276/FUL), the County Council confirmed that a scheme creating an additional 70 places could be possible (350-420 places). With the 200 dwellings proposed in this Neighbourhood Plan and the 163 allowed by the appeal, around 90 primary-aged children are likely to be needing places as a result of growth. Whilst this would appear to be a shortfall, some additional capacity (the 20 places) would arise from not admitting out of catchment children (places at other schools are available to accommodate this). Therefore, additional local capacity has already been programmed to account for housing growth. The Town Council and the District Council receive income from the Community Infrastructure Levy that is to pay for the infrastructure improvements arising from additional growth. The County Council will work with both councils and the developers to programme when the additional places are needed and the resultant funding requirement.

The opportunity of moving the Primary School (Reserve Site Policy) in the short-term is no longer necessary but the reservation of the site in the Neighbourhood Plan is still needed to ensure that additional places could be provided should further growth emerge (increases in the number of homes or through demographic change within the existing community). Without the land being reserved, the Education Authority could not programme for additional capacity beyond that which is currently expected.

Secondary

In responding to Suffolk Coastal's site allocations document, the County Highlighted the following forecasts for 2019/20:

	Capacity	Number on Roll, 2019/20	Houses	Pupil Yield	Available Capacity, with new dwellings	Maintaining 5% Spare Places
Thomas Mills	1136	988	240	51	97	40

The likely increase in pupils resulting from the 163 additional dwellings approved by the Mount Pleasant is 36, which is below the level to maintain 5% capacity. However, these forecasts might change over time, resulting in further capacity being required.

- **PRE-SCHOOL** – NEED TO ADD RELEVANT INFO PROVIDED BY SCC TO FNP NARRATIVE – OTHER COMMENTS NOTED.
- **PRIMARY** – COMMENTS NOTED AND RELEVANT INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN FNP NARRATIVE.
- **SECONDARY** – COMMENTS NOTED – NO ACTION NECESSARY.

Archaeology

Framingham's heritage is recognised as being in need of protection and that it is linked to the tourism economy. However, there is no acknowledgment that detailed archaeological evaluation (and mitigation where appropriate) is required for the majority of the proposed site allocations. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service routinely advises that there should be early consultation of the Historic Environment Record and assessment of the archaeological potential of proposed sites at an appropriate stage in the design of new developments, in order that the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan policies are met. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service is happy to advise on the requirements for development schemes upon request.

The Plan could illustrate the significance further and the following are suggestions to be included at: 2.2 "Roman remains in the form of finds scatters and cut features have also been recorded from several sites around the town, as well as finds scatters which are also indicative of Iron Age activity."

2.2 "The historic core of Framlingham itself, outlined in the County Historic Environment Record (FML 052), is an area which Suffolk County Council's Archaeological Service considers likely to have complex and sensitive archaeological deposits relating to occupation from the medieval period onwards, and where even the smallest scale below-ground works may have an impact on archaeological remains. The Castle is a Scheduled Monument (FML 001 SF3) and so the impact of any development upon the setting of this site must be taken into consideration."

2.9 "the medieval street pattern still survives in the historic town centre."

The County Council's Archaeological Service, having considered the evidence available in the Historic Environment Record, does not believe that the potential for heritage assets is sufficient to prevent the allocation of these sites. However, the majority of these sites will require a scheme of archaeological evaluation (followed by appropriate mitigation). Further, site-by-site, comments are appended to this letter to alert the Parish Council (and other interested parties) to the current position.

- ADD COMMENT 2.2 to FNP.
- ADD COMMENT 2.9 to FNP.
- FRAM 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 & 31 APPROPRIATELY AMMENDED TO
- INCLUDE ARCHAEOLOGICAL COMMENT.

Libraries

No improvements are identified as being required. The increase in the number of dwellings will increase demands on the service and there is the potential for the Community Infrastructure Levy to be used to mitigate these impacts and improve facilities. Opportunities and priorities might change over time, such as those that might be identified by the library friends group, and the Plan could highlight that potential improvements could come forward if opportunities arose.

- NO ACTION NECESSARY

Sustainable urban Drainage

Minimising flood risk is an objective of the Plan. No specific policy response is proposed but the requirements for assessments and how applications are to be determined is properly the function of the district council's plan. Whilst landowners and developers would assess flood risk and confirm the drainage strategy, the Plan could reflect on any local conditions that could affect how the allocated sites come forward. Further information on the range of support available to local authorities and developers can be found in the *Protocol for Local Planning Authorities and Developers on SuDS, Surface Water Drainage and Local Flood Risk in Suffolk*.

- NO ACTION NECESSARY

Adult Care

The addition of policy FRAM4 (Design Standards) is welcome. One criterion refers to homes for the elderly and downsizing households. The potential for homes to achieve a higher accessibility standard would provide accommodation to support people who need care provided in the home. The design of homes will also have an impact on their future adaptability should that be needed to accommodate future care and support needs. The Neighbourhood Plan could refer to the need to address this requirement as one of the 10 essential criteria.

Some consideration could also be given on designating a site, ideally one close to local amenities, for the development of specialist housing to accommodate those with care and support needs. This may be aimed at older people or other adults. Shortfalls in provision are forecast in the District and, as one of the main market towns, a site in Framlingham could meet this need. Suffolk County Council's Commissioners for Adult Services would be happy to work with the Town Council to develop specific recommendations in this respect.

- COMMENTS NOTED – ACTION IN NON-POLICY ACTIONS – TO FOLLOW UP WITH COMMISSIONERS FOR ADULT SERVICES AT SCC

Natural Environment

The vision is to further extend and enhance managed 'green' spaces to increase biodiversity and protect sensitive areas. Given the extent of the Parish boundary, the landscape setting of Framlingham could be a stronger element in the plan. However, the policies within the local plan and the identification of important views (FRAM6) ensure that landscape considerations are factored into any proposed development. Policies contained in Suffolk Coastal's local plan also provide the mechanism to consider landscape and ecological impacts.

- COMMENTS NOTED – NO ACTION NECESSARY

Health and Wellbeing

The Plan reflects the provision of facilities within the town and transportation to Ipswich. The plan also makes the connection to physical activity in sports provision and the promotion of cycling. The Plan places a substantial significance to active travel routes, particularly for children.

The role of community organisations should be considered as part of the fabric that promotes wellbeing. However, the need for a Community Centre is identified and, through reference in the vision, is a clear priority.

Policy FRAM11 promotes the provision, particularly within developments. Community growing spaces supports health and well-being aims and is one of the six themes of healthy weight environments identified by the Town and County Planning Association.

- NO ACTION NECESSARY

Energy efficiency

The document does highlight the potential for photo-voltaic arrays, which is a positive approach. There is the suggestion of residents saving money on bills. The "fabric-first" approach included in policy FRAM5 is to be welcomed.

- NO ACTION NECESSARY

Minerals & Waste

The Plan identifies whether the provision of waste and recycling facilities is needed to meet current and future needs. Mention is made to energy from waste and there is recognition of the level of investment and, therefore, the necessary scale.

Like Neighbourhood Plans, the Minerals and Waste Local Plans set out land allocations and policies that are used to determine planning applications. Most of the policies in the Minerals Core Strategy (2008), the Minerals Site Allocations (2009) and the Waste Core Strategy (2011) relate to those types of development. However, specific allocations and safeguarding policies do affect plans prepared by district and parish councils.

Policy WDM17 of the Waste Core Strategy set out the requirement for consideration of waste management and the use of recycled materials (avoiding the use of primary aggregates) in new development. These are also features included in the Building for Life criteria and would be in line with the National Planning Policy for Waste (para. 8) that seeks sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities with the rest of the development.

The proposals in Framlingham's neighbourhood plan are not covered by a Minerals Consultation Area (an area to the south east within the parish boundary is included) or a specific allocation.

- NO ACTION NECESSARY

Broadband

In discussing any proposals further, the County Council would recommend that all development is equipped with high speed broadband (fibre optic). This facilitates home working which has associated benefits for the transport network and also contributes to social inclusion; it also impacts educational attainment and social wellbeing, as well as improving sales as purchasers are checking the availability and speed of broadband.

As a minimum, access line speeds should be greater than 30Mbps, using a fibre based broadband solution, rather than exchange based ADSL, ADSL2+ or exchange only connections. Full fibre provision should be made, bringing fibre cables to each premise within the development (FTTP/FTTH). This will provide a network infrastructure which is fit for the future and will enable faster broadband.

- ADDRESS COMMENTS IN NON-POLICY ACTIONS.

I hope that the above provides you with an understanding of the county council's position on the content of the neighbourhood plan.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'James Cutting', written in a cursive style.

James Cutting
Planning Strategy Manager
Resource Management

Appendix A

Site-by-site comments from Suffolk County Council's Archaeological Service

Fram 22- This site lies in an area of that is topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking a tributary of the River Ore. The site has a frontage on a historic route way into Framlingham, which was an important Anglo-Saxon and Medieval centre. However, this site has never been the subject of systematic archaeological investigations and previously unidentified remains may exist on the site which could be damaged or destroyed by development. No objection in principle, but this site will require a planning condition under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation.

Fram 23- This large site option lies in an area of that is topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking a tributary of the River Ore. The site has a frontage on a historic route way into Framlingham, which was an important Anglo-Saxon and Medieval centre. However, this site has never been the subject of systematic archaeological investigations and previously unidentified remains may exist on the site which could be damaged or destroyed by development. The site should be subject to assessment at an appropriate pre-application stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Geophysical survey would be appropriate in the first instance, to be followed by a trial trenched evaluation.

Fram 24- The site has already been subject to archaeological assessment and no further investigation is required.

Fram 25- This site lies in an area of archaeological potential recorded in the County Historic Environment Record, immediately west of the medieval town (FML 052) and in a topographically favourable location or early occupation, overlooking a tributary of the River Ore. As such, there is high potential for encountering archaeological deposits at this location. No objection in principle, but this site will require a planning condition under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation.

Fram 26- This application is located in an area of archaeological interest and potential. On Fore Street, which is part of the medieval core of Framlingham (County Historic Environment Record FML 052), undated archaeological features were recorded to the east (FML 040) and an archaeological evaluation carried out to the south of the proposed development site detected ditches containing Roman pottery and prehistoric flints. As such, there is high potential for encountering archaeological deposits at this location. No objection in principle, but will require a planning condition under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation.

Fram 27- This large site option lies in an area of that is topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking a tributary of the River Ore. Scatters of multi-period finds have also been recorded within the direct vicinity of this site allocation (FML 056 and 066). However, this site has never been the subject of systematic archaeological investigations and previously unidentified remains may exist on the site which could be damaged or destroyed by development. The site should be subject to assessment at an appropriate pre-application stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Geophysical survey would be appropriate in the first instance, to be followed by a trial trenched evaluation.

Fram 28- This large site option lies in an area of that is topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking a tributary of the River Ore. A post-medieval tower mill is also recorded on the edge of the proposal area (FML 024). However, this site has never been the subject of systematic archaeological investigations and previously unidentified remains may exist on the site which could be damaged or destroyed by development. The site should be subject to assessment at an appropriate pre-application stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Geophysical survey would be appropriate in the first instance, to be followed by a trial trenched evaluation.

Fram 29- This site lies in an area of archaeological potential recorded in the County Historic Environment Record, in a topographically favourable location or early occupation, overlooking a tributary of the River Ore. A post-medieval tower mill is also recorded on the edge of the proposal area (FML 024). As such, there is high potential for encountering archaeological deposits at this location. No objection in principle, but a planning condition will be required under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation.

Fram 30- This large site option lies in an area of that is topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking a tributary of the River Ore. Scatters of prehistoric and Roman finds have also been recorded to the south of this proposal area (FML 007 and 008). However, this site has never been the subject of systematic archaeological investigations and previously unidentified remains may exist on the site which could be damaged or destroyed by development. The site should be subject to assessment at an appropriate pre-application stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Geophysical survey would be appropriate in the first instance, to be followed by a trial trenched evaluation.

Fram 31- No archaeological assessment is required at this site

- **Appendix A SITE –BY – SITE COMMENTS TO BE AMMENDED ACOORDINGLY AS PER COMMENTS ON ARCHAEOLOGY**

Date: 25 August 2015
Our ref: 162010
Your ref:



Mrs Eileen Coe
townclerk@framlingham.com

Customer Services
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mrs Coe,

Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan Pre Submission Consultation Draft

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 6th August 2015.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

We support the vision for the green environment to extend and enhance green spaces thereby increasing levels of biodiversity and protection of sensitive areas, as well as that of new housing development, ensuring the necessary improvements to infrastructure are provided.

We are also in support of your objectives to allow 'Sensitive development which protects and enriches the landscape and built setting; endorsing policies that have a positive effect on the environment, including those that remove or minimise flood risk, mitigate climate change, promote biodiversity and reduce our carbon footprint' and 'Protecting greenspace, the landscape and maintaining the high quality natural environment with its protected wildlife interests'.

Natural England has no concerns in principle with the proposed location and scale of development in Framlingham. The Plan boundary does not include any statutorily designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. However, in order for the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) to achieve a conclusion of no likely significant effect, we have the following advice.

We recommend that Framlingham NP specifically includes a reference to the findings and mitigation measures identified through Suffolk Coastal District Council's Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment. The Appropriate Assessment was unable to rule out adverse effects on European sites through increased recreational disturbance as a result of in-combination housing development in the market towns east of Ipswich. The Appropriate Assessment identified mitigation measures to address these adverse effects including on-site open space provision (particularly to cater for regular users including dog-walkers) and visitor management and monitoring of recreational pressure on the relevant European sites including Sandlings Special Protection Area (SPA), Minsmere-Walberswick SPA/Ramsar site and Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths & Marshes Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

In taking forward housing development in Framlingham, the NP should have regard to the need for these mitigation measures to be delivered to ensure no adverse effects on the European sites. Natural England is satisfied that the Framlingham NP aims to deliver the 'on-site open space provision' element of the mitigation through Policy G1; however, to ensure certainty of delivery of this mitigation we advise that a requirement for the inclusion of open space should be specified within the housing policy for Framlingham. We suggest that a map showing the location of open

space within the Neighbourhood should be included in the NP.

We understand that the other elements of the mitigation identified through the Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment, including visitor management and recreational disturbance on N2K sites, will be delivered through the emerging Suffolk Coastal District Council Green Infrastructure Strategy. This will include details and a timeframe for the implementation of the required mitigation and a funding mechanism for its delivery. We advise that the NP makes clear reference to this strategy, and the requirement for the mitigation to be delivered within an appropriate time-frame to ensure housing development in Framlingham will not have an adverse effect on the European sites.

Amendments to the NP in accordance with our advice above will enable the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to conclude that the NP is unlikely to have a significant effect on European sites. If the NP and HRA can be amended accordingly we will be pleased to provide further comment.

The lack of specific comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may make comments that will help the Parish/Town Council or Neighbourhood Forum to fully take account of the environmental value of this area in their decision making process.

I hope these comments are helpful. For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Kate Ginn on 07876034621. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

Kate Ginn
Sustainable Land Use Adviser

