



MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

MARTLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL

MAY 2017



CONTENTS

		PAGE
1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	THE CONSULTATION PROCESS	4
3	THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AREA	5
4	INITIAL STAGE OF THE PLAN	6 - 7
5	PREPARATION OF THE PLAN	8 - 10
6	SUMMARY OF MAIN CONCERNS	11 - 12
7	PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14)	14
8	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT	15

APPENDICES

	BUSINESS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	17 - 22
	TEEN SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	23 - 27
	HOUSEHOLD SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	28 - 46
	MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES	47 - 59
	PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTEES	60 - 61
	CONSULTATION EVIDENCE HELD BY PARISH COUNCIL	62 - 66
	PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14) CONSULTATION COMMENTS	67 - 158

INTRODUCTION

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfill the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2015 (as amended).

This statement includes: -

- Details of people and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan
- An explanation of how they were consulted
- A summary of the main issues and concerns raised by those consulted
- A description of how the issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan

THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

In preparing the Neighbourhood Plan, a consultation process has been undertaken to engage with a broad a cross section of the community and other interested parties as possible and was carried out in the following ways:

- Initial evening open meetings
- Evening drop in sessions in Martlesham and Martlesham Heath for residents to raise issues that were important to them and wished to be included in the Plan
- Posters and leaflets advertising open meetings
- Regular articles in Martlesham Monthly (a free monthly magazine distributed to every house in Martlesham Parish)(see appendix)
- Newsletter inserts in Martlesham Monthly
- Martlesham 2018 website (<http://martleshamnp.onesuffolk.net/>) and links to social media sites.
- Press releases to local newspapers the East Anglian Daily Times and Ipswich Star
- A household survey questionnaire distributed and collected to every household.
- Availability of internet and emails for comments and responses from residents
- A meeting arranged with the Directors of Martlesham Householders Ltd a company owned by the residents of Martlesham and responsible for the maintenance of open spaces on Martlesham Heath, giving details of the Martlesham Plan. They subsequently submitted a written response with their comments
- A meeting arranged with Martlesham Community Council to provide details of the Martlesham Plan. They subsequently submitted a written response with their comments
- Information from the management of the 3 Community buildings
- A survey using Survey Monkey aimed at teenagers
- A survey questionnaire distributed and collected from the businesses in Martlesham
- Meetings with landlords and managers of the commercial areas in Martlesham.
- Meeting with Tim Passmore PCC for Suffolk Police who's HQ is situated in Martlesham.
- Survey of Estate Agents for information on local housing demand.
- Meeting with Denise Lavender of Air Quality Monitoring
- Views sought from local care homes in adjoining parishes and Seckford Almshouses in Woodbridge regarding local facilities for the ageing population
- Reference to Ploszajski Lynch Consulting (2014) *Suffolk Coastal District Council: Built Facilities Assessment*, for Suffolk Coastal District Council

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AREA

Initially it was assumed that the Neighbourhood Plan area could cover the whole of the Parish and would include the Adastral Park site, a proposed large development of 2000 houses and employment area. At an early stage (June 2013) meetings were held with neighbouring parishes at Waldringfield and Brightwell who agreed that those parts of their Parish, which were included in the Adastral Park development, could be included in the Martlesham Plan. Martlesham Parish Council made the first submission of the Martlesham Area to Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) in July 2013. This was finally rejected by SCDC in April 2014 as they wished to exclude Adastral Park from the Neighbourhood Area. Following discussions, Martlesham Parish Council withdrew its application in June 2014.

A new submission of the Neighbourhood Area was made to SCDC in December 2014.

In May 2015 SCDC rejected this application but subsequently approved a revised Neighbourhood Area which excluded the North Ward of Martlesham as they considered this should be part of the Woodbridge Neighbourhood Plan Area. A letter was sent to the residents of North Ward explaining the position. In September 2016 Woodbridge Town Council decided to abandon their Neighbourhood Plan, which means a part of the Martlesham Parish, is not covered by a Neighbourhood Plan.

INITIAL STAGES OF THE PLAN

- After a presentation to the Parish Council on 12th December 2012 by Chris Bowden of Navigus Planning, the Council decided to obtain a response from the residents regarding producing a Neighbourhood Plan.
- Adverts were placed in the local newspaper and parish magazine (Martlesham Monthly) and leaflets distributed to all householders advising of a public meeting which took place on 19th March 2013
- 140 people attended the public meeting, most agreeing with proceeding with the Neighbourhood Plan. 57 expressed an interest in helping with the Plan
- April 2013 the Parish Council agreed to proceed with the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan by passing the following Resolution:-

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN RESOLUTION April 2013

RESOLUTION C2013/4c – The Parish Council agrees to facilitate the production of a Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The next steps were agreed as detailed below: -

1. The formation of a NP Steering Group consisting of councillors and a representative from each of the sub groups, with a minimum of 2 councillors and a maximum of 4. The Steering Group would operate as a Working Group of the Parish Council. The Steering Group would report back on progress to the PC on a monthly basis.

2. The formation of a Stakeholder Panel, run by the Steering Group with meetings as required. The Stakeholders would include representatives from: District Council, Brightwell Parish Council, Waldringfield Parish Council, Martlesham Business Park, Martlesham Retail Park, The Square Martlesham Heath, BT and MHHL.

3. The DPC Chair to organise 3 meetings for those that expressed an interest in helping during the next few weeks.

The meetings to identify which areas people wished to help (including being on the Steering Group), the issues they thought important and possible groups that might be established (which would report to the Steering Group). Agreed.

RESOLUTION C2013/4d – The Parish Council to budget £10,000.00 under earmarked reserves for the Neighbourhood Plan. Agreed.

RESOLUTION C2013/4e – To accept the Terms of Reference for the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group as detailed below: -

The Steering Group operates as a Working Group of the PC

All members agree to abide by the Nolan Public service code of conduct

The Steering Group can establish sub groups to cover specific areas of the NP, one member of the sub group must be a member of the Steering Group

All members agree to abide by the Nolan Public service code of conduct
The Steering Group can establish sub groups to cover specific areas of the NP,
one member of the sub group must be a member of the Steering Group
The Steering Group is the final arbitrator on sub group issues
The Steering group reports to the PC on progress on a monthly basis
Any issues raised by the Steering Group are initially dealt with by the DPC
The purpose of the Steering Group is to enable a NP for Martlesham, once that task has been achieved the group will be disbanded
Any non-planning issues identified by the Group will be documented and passed to the PC



Visioning Workshop Aug 2013

PREPARATION OF THE PLAN

May to July 2013	Various meetings took place to organize teams to work on the Neighbourhood Plan. At the start the Plan team consisted of 4 Parish Councillors, 4 Parishioners and 6 other plan area teams representatives. Each of the plan area teams had a representative to enable overall coordination. Teams were set up to cover: Housing, Infrastructure, Recreation & Leisure Roads & Transport Environment. Business and Retail
July 2013	There were informal meetings with neighbouring Parishes Brightwell and Waldringfield with regard to the common interest in the proposed Adastral Park development and an initial agreement to include part of the parish of Waldringfield relating to the Adastral Park development in the Martlesham Plan.
31 st July 2013	Martlesham Parish Council submitted to Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) an application for the designation of the Neighbourhood Plan based on the whole of the Parish of Martlesham and parts of Waldringfield and Brightwell.
August – October 2013.	Various meetings of the Plan teams took place to identify issues to be included in the Plan and the consultation process.
5 th August 2013	A visioning workshop was arranged to agree and produce a vision statement for the Neighbourhood Plan
October 2013	SCDC rejects the Neighbourhood Area application as they wished to exclude the area of Adastral Park. The PPT agreed that the vision statement would not need amending.
November 2013.	Martlesham2028 website (http://martleshamnp.onesuffolk.net/) was set up to keep people advised of progress of the plan. There were links to social media sites Twitter, Facebook, Stumbleupon, Delicious, Google Bookmark and MySpace.
December 2013	Local schools were advised that a Facebook account had been set up specifically for teenagers to post their views.

There were three open meetings arranged. All were advertised by means of posters on noticeboards, articles in the Martlesham Monthly and adverts and press releases in the East Anglian Daily Times. There was also a banner, which was on display at Martlesham and Martlesham Heath. Also letters were sent to residents of Martlesham North Ward advising of the meetings, as at this stage they were included in the Neighbourhood Plan area

23rd January 2014	52 people attended an evening public meeting at St Michaels Church Martlesham Heath at 7:30 pm to update residents of progress with the Neighbourhood Plan and seek views.
29th March 2014	33 people attended a Saturday morning drop in session at the village green Martlesham Heath for residents to obtain updates on the Neighbourhood Plan and express their views.
8th April 2014	25 people attended an evening public meeting at 7:00 pm at the Christian Fellowship Hall (adjacent to Martlesham Academy) in Martlesham to update residents of progress with the Neighbourhood Plan and obtain feedback.
The feedback and comments from these open meetings were then considered and formed the main basis of the questions in the household survey	
May 2014	A competition was launched with Kesgrave High School to involve the pupils in designing a logo to be used by the Neighbourhood Plan. A prize was offered for the winner of the competition
June 2014	Efforts were made to engage the pupils of Kesgrave High School into producing their own survey. Initially a useful discussion meeting was arranged with a representative group of children. Unfortunately due to staff changes at the school the project was not completed
September 2014	A household survey was carried out with 2280 questionnaires being hand delivered to every house in the Parish. The completed questionnaires were collected or could be posted in various postboxes available in the parish. There was also the facility to complete the survey using Survey Monkey online. A prize draw was offered to encourage responses. There were 901 responses. A response rate of nearly 40%
December 2014	A consultation questionnaire was completed by carrying out visits to businesses in the parish
November 2014.	A meeting took place with the Landlords of the Square in Martlesham Heath
November 2014.	Results of the household survey were published on the website and a summary printed in Martlesham Monthly
<p>Several meetings were arranged by the PPT teams for in depth analysis of the survey results and to formulate policies for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Areas of concern that fell outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan were recorded as non Neighbourhood Plan actions to be taken forward by the Parish Council. These discussions carried on up until the Draft Plan was produced in October 2016</p>	
December 2014.	The Parish Council submitted to SCDC a revised Neighbourhood Plan boundary area that now excluded any of the Adastral Park development.
8th Jan 2015	A meeting was arranged with Will Barton managing agents for owners of Martlesham Heath village square
13th January 2015	A meeting was arranged with Innovation Martlesham who are a cluster of High Tec companies based within Adastral Park

February 2015	A meeting of the PPT agreed to allow Woodbridge Neighbourhood Plan to include Martlesham North Ward
May 2015.	SCDC agree a Neighbourhood Plan boundary which will exclude Adastral Park and also Martlesham North Ward (to be part of Woodbridge Neighbourhood Plan) A press release for the local paper was made.
June 2015.	A meeting took place with BT who are owners/developers of Adastral Park
August 2015	148 questionnaires hand delivered and collected to all business premises on Martlesham Business Park and other smaller businesses in the parish (other than those on the British Telecom site) A covering letter also invited business owners/managers to an open meeting on 29 th September 2015.
16 th September 2015	A meeting with Max Industrias owners of the Martlesham Industrial Park
September 2015.	An online survey targeting teenagers was set up. Headmasters at the secondary schools agreed to send email to pupils advising of the survey on Survey Monkey. Paper copies of the survey were also delivered to youth groups Scout and Guides. The response rate was quite low with 29 respondents to the online survey via survey monkey in June 2015, and a further 7 paper questionnaires were received in 2016. Not all questions were answered by all respondents.
November 2015.	A meeting arranged with Lindsey Club a representative from Graingers who are owners of property and land on Martlesham Heath
3 rd December 2015	A meeting arranged with Tim Passmore Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk. Suffolk police HQ is based at Martlesham
January 2016 – September 2016.	Many meetings of the PPT discussing and formulating Policies to be included in the Plan.
September 2016.	Woodbridge Town Council decides not to proceed with their plan. This meant no Neighbourhood Plan would cover the Martlesham North Ward.
October 2016.	Draft Plan ready for 6 week Regulation 14 consultation period. Plans made to prepare for the consultation process.

SUMMARY OF MAIN CONCERNS

At the beginning, the major concern of residents was the proposed development at Adastral Park consisting of 2000 houses and the impact this would have on the Parish. Subsequently SCDC decided to exclude Adastral Park from the Neighbourhood Plan Area.

This resulted in a rethink of part of the Plan, especially in respect of future housing development in the parish, but it was still considered a worthwhile project as a way of helping to identify and address the issues which would arise from a substantial increase of population, as well as dealing with other matters which had been identified. It was agreed by the PPT that the vision statement of the plan would not need amendment.

The household questionnaire in September 2014 did produce excellent evidence of the wishes of the residents including: -

- Protect open spaces and woodlands on Martlesham Heath and between Martlesham and Woodbridge
- Protect special landscape areas and woodlands
- Control expansion of development
- Community buildings extensively used but in need of upgrading
- Need for indoor sports facilities
- Important to retain doctors surgery and local shops
- Play areas to be upgraded to cater for all ages and the disabled
- Difficulty in crossing and accessing the A12 dual carriage trunk road which bisects the parish North to South
- Improve facilities for cyclists and pedestrians
- Requirement for suitable accommodation for elderly

The Teen survey highlighted the following issues: -

- Most do not use the existing recreation and community facilities
- Most have to travel away from Martlesham for their sport
- A large number of car journeys are made for the benefit of this group

The Business consultation and survey identified the following: -

- There is a wide diversification of businesses including manufacturing, retail, leisure and legal, employing between them over 3000 people.
- There are some issues with inadequate broadband
- Parking is probably the most contentious problem facing the industrial/retail park of Martlesham. Acutely felt at Beardmore Park which is the location for several major stores attracting shoppers from around a wide area of the district

The PPT team also considered as to whether there were any groups in the parish that did not engage well in the consultation process. The population is mostly concentrated in two areas viz Martlesham and Martlesham Heath and so public meetings were arranged at different times in the evenings in central sites for Martlesham and Martlesham Heath.

There are no care homes or sheltered accommodation in the parish which would need special arrangements.

There is a very small number of ethnic minorities but no evidence of language difficulties.

Teenagers were regarded as a group difficult to engage with, also schooling for this group is outside the parish and consequently mixed with groups from outside of the parish. Although extra efforts were made to target teenagers from Martlesham, the response rate was low.

The high response rate to the household survey (nearly 40%) broadly reflected the profile of the population of Martlesham (2011 census) and therefore it was felt that the consultation process had fully covered the parishioners.



Drop in meeting
January 2014



Post-it comments
from Drop in
Meeting Jan 2014

PRE- SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14)

The consultation period ran from 14th November 2016 until 31st January 2017.

- Details of the consultation process were widely publicised in the Martlesham Monthly, and by posters on local noticeboards.
- A copy of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan was available on the website. (<http://martleshamnp.onesuffolk.net/>)
- A précis of the Plan was delivered to all householders and businesses. Responses were invited by completing a response form or using email. There were special post boxes at several sites for those wishing to post their replies.
- Evening drop in sessions at Martlesham and Martlesham Heath were arranged on :-

6th December 2016 Martlesham Primary Academy

12th December 2016 Martlesham Parish Room

15th December 2016 Church Centre Martlesham Heath

30th January 2017. Martlesham Parish Room

to enable residents to discuss any issues with the PPT team or leave comments.

- Hard copies of Plan were made available at St Michaels Café and from the Parish office for those who needed them.
- There was also the offer of meeting and addressing individual groups regarding the plan or those needing assistance.

STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT

As is required by the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations, when the draft Neighbourhood Plan was put out to consultation at Regulation 14 stage, Martlesham Parish Council formally requested a screening opinion from SCDC on the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). Responses were received from Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency all stating that they did not consider an SEA or an HRA to be necessary. SCDC concurred and completed its screening opinion confirming this to be the case. The Screening Report has been submitted as a separate document.

APPENDICES

Hard or electronic copies of documents produced in connection with the Neighbourhood Plan are available from Martlesham Parish Office

BUSINESS SURVEY

Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan

Industrial Consultation

Q1 Is your business located?

Please tick one or more of the following...

In domestic premises
On an industrial estate
On an agricultural holding

<input type="checkbox"/>	In an Amenity area
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other

Q2 Into which category does your business fall?

Please tick one or more of the following...

Agriculture/Horticulture
Food Processing
Retail
Construction
Finance/Professional
Manufacturing
Transport

<input type="checkbox"/>	Tourism eg. Hotels, catering, B&B
<input type="checkbox"/>	Health and Beauty
<input type="checkbox"/>	Childcare
<input type="checkbox"/>	Medical care
<input type="checkbox"/>	Servicing eg motor, maintenance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other

Q3 How many people do you currently employ who are?

Please put numbers in the boxes

Permanent
Seasonal

<input type="checkbox"/>	Temporary
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sub-contracted

Q4 How many of these employees do you understand to live in Martlesham?

Please put numbers in the boxes

Local

<input type="checkbox"/>	Not local
--------------------------	-----------

Q5 Do any of your employees have problems finding accommodation?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes, generally
Occasionally
No

BUSINESS SURVEY - CONTINUED

Q6 If you needed to expand the size of your business premises, would you be able to do that in Marlesham

Please tick one of the following...

Yes
No

Q7 Do you expect to create job opportunities in the future?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes
No

Q8 Do you have a shortage of unskilled employees?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes
No

Q9 Do you have a shortage of skilled employees?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes
No

Q10 If you have had problems filling job vacancies over the last 12 months was it because of.....?

Please tick one or more of the following...

Lack of applicants with required skills
Lack of applicants with required qualifications
Unsociable hours or shift work

Lack of public transport
Lack of suitable candidates with basic ability

Q11 How do you advertise your job vacancies?

Please tick one or more of the following...

Job Centre
Local Radio
Word of mouth
Local press

County press
National press
College/University

BUSINESS SURVEY - CONTINUED

Q12 Would you find any of the following useful?

Please tick one or more of the following...

Information on small business support systems
Information on training schemes
Local jobs Vacancy Board
Local Business Forum

Q13 Would you use a meeting room in Martlesham if this was available?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes - approximately monthly
Yes - approximately 6 monthly
Yes - annually
Not very likely

Q14 What communication methods do you currently use

Please tick one or more of the following...

Business magazines
Business agents
Email with other local businesses

Local networking meetings
None of the above
Other

Q15 Are the roads adequate and satisfactorily maintained throughout the year?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes
No (Please specify why/where not)

Q16 Do you advise drivers making deliveries to use a specific route?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes
No

Q17 Do you consider the directional signs to your business adequate?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes
No (Please explain)

BUSINESS SURVEY - CONTINUED

Q18 Do you consider that the Marlesham industrial estates could be improved by...?

Please tick one or more of the following...

Traffic calming measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	More off-road parking
Wider pavements	<input type="checkbox"/>	Giving pedestrians priority
Keeping non-essential HGV's out	<input type="checkbox"/>	It does not need improvement

Q19 Do you consider that there is a shortage of suitable business premises in Martlesham?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q20 If you feel there is a shortage of suitable premises, does the shortage relate to...?

Please tick one or more of the following...

Office space	<input type="checkbox"/>	Small factory units
Storage space	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parking areas
Light assembly/small workshops	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify)

Q21 What size of small commercial workspace units do you consider are needed?

Please tick one or more of the following...

10 - 20 square metres
20 - 40 square metres
over 40 square metres

Q22 Do you have experience of the local planning authority?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes
NO

Q23 Are there any improvements in the planning process or administration of the District Council that you would like to see?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes (Please specify)
NO
Don't know / no opinion

BUSINESS SURVEY - CONTINUED

Q24 Are there any improvements in the planning process or administration of the County Council that you would like to see?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes (Please specify)	<input type="text"/>
NO	<input type="text"/>
Don't know / no opinion	<input type="text"/>

<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>

Q25 Does your business consider the amount of energy used, and do you...?

Please tick one or more of the following...

Turn appliances off at the mains	<input type="text"/>
Don't leave computers on standby overnight	<input type="text"/>
Installed reactive lights	<input type="text"/>

<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>

Q26 Would you be interested in having an energy audit carried out, free of charge, to assess areas where savings could be made?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes	<input type="text"/>
No	<input type="text"/>

<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>

Q27 Would you be interested in receiving information regarding renewable energy and/or an audit to access potential for applying renewable energy technologies?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes	<input type="text"/>
-----	----------------------

<input type="text"/>

No

Q28 How do you rate the following services?

Please rate the following by writing the relevant number in the box...

1 = Satisfactory

2 = Unsatisfactory

3 = Do not use

Mains water supply	<input type="text"/>
Mains gas supply	<input type="text"/>
Mains electricity	<input type="text"/>
Sewerage / Foul water	<input type="text"/>
Refuse collection	<input type="text"/>

<input type="text"/>

Street lighting
Roadside care
Street cleaning
Winter weather service

BUSINESS SURVEY - CONTINUED

Q29 How do you rate the following services?

Please rate the following by writing the relevant number in the box...

1 = Satisfactory

2 = Unsatisfactory

3 = Do not use

Landline telephone
Mobile phone
Postal services

Internet
Delivery services
Courier services

Q30 Are you aware that there is an economic development officer at your District and County Council who can signpost you to local business services?

Please rate the following by writing the relevant number in the box...

1 = Yes

2 = No

District Council
County Council

Q31 Are you aware of any grant aid for rural businesses?

Please tick one of the following...

Yes

No

TEEN SURVEY

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Martlesham Parish Council are producing a local Neighbourhood Plan to be focused on the specific needs of the Parish of Martlesham and to enable residents to have their say about the types of improvements and changes they would like to see happen, and which could influence planning decisions over the next 15 years.

There have been various consultations, meetings and a household survey during the past few months.

This questionnaire is to enable the younger members of the Parish to provide their input regarding their Sports/Recreation/Leisure activities.

Completion of the questionnaire is voluntary and is completely anonymous so feel free to add any relevant comments.

Details of the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan can be found at www.martlesham2028.org.uk

TEEN SURVEY - CONTINUED

Do you use any of the following Martlesham Community buildings for any of your leisure activities?

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Martlesham Heath Pavilion (the green Martlesham Heath) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Richards Room (Old Felixstowe Rd) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Martlesham Community Hall (Old Felixstowe Rd) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Old Martlesham Village Hall (Top Street Martlesham) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Do you use any of the following Martlesham recreation areas?

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Jubilee Play Space (rear of Carol Ave by Beacon Hill School) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Diamond Jubilee Bike Trails (BMX Dirt Jumps) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Centenary Play area (near Gorseland School) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Martlesham Recreation Ground (near the Creek) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Others (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

TEEN SURVEY - CONTINUED

Do these Play Areas meet your needs?

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Jubilee Play Space (rear of Carol Ave by Beacon Hill School) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Diamond Jubilee Bike Trails (BMX Dirt Jumps) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Centenary Play area (near Gorseland School) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Martlesham Recreation Ground (near the Creek) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Please tick the boxes if you take part in any of the following activities and indicate whether you use facilities in Martlesham Parish or elsewhere

	Martlesham	Elsewhere	Martlesham	Elsewhere
Athletics/track sports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Football	<input type="checkbox"/>
Badminton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hockey	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cricket	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Martial Arts	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rugby	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exercise/keep fit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Squash	<input type="checkbox"/>
Swimming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Table Tennis	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tennis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Skateboarding	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you think there are sufficient leisure facilities for teenagers living in Martlesham?

- Yes No

TEEN SURVEY - CONTINUED

Do you think there is a need for additional sports/leisure facilities in Martlesham for teenagers?

Yes No

Do you belong to any of the following youth organisations?

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Martlesham | Elsewhere |
| Scouts | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Guides | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Rangers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Youth Club | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please state) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Which transport methods do you usually use to get to the following destinations: -

	Bus	School Bus	Cycle	Lift in Car	Walk	None
School	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Work (if any)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Sports	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Leisure	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Ipswich	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Kesgrave	<input type="checkbox"/>					

TEEN SURVEY - CONTINUED

If you cycle do you think current arrangements for cyclists are adequate ?

Yes

No

Do you think the current public transport system for travelling to and from Martlesham is adequate?

Yes

No

Finally for statistical purposes would you please advise: -

Your age

Your Gender

Your home Post Code

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

THE PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is for all Martlesham residents to have their say about the types of improvements and changes they would like to see happen within Martlesham as well as any features of the village they would like to remain the same. Feedback from this survey will be used to create a Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan, which will influence planning decisions over the next 15 years. Once approved, it will become a legal planning document which must be taken into account when planning decisions are made.

ABOUT THE MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The Local Plan, produced by Suffolk Coastal District Coastal, covers the whole district, whereas our Neighbourhood Plan will be more focused on the specific needs of Martlesham - it allows us, the local community, to specify in more detail what we expect from future development and where it should be located. This includes housing developments as well as, for example, priorities for improvements to:

- pedestrian links and paths
- open spaces, streets and public spaces
- community amenities/facilities.

The area covered by our Neighbourhood Plan will follow the existing Martlesham Parish boundary, but it will exclude the BT Adastral Park site. Suffolk Coastal will manage the development of this area through a 'Site Specific Plan' in consultation with the local community; feedback from this survey will feed into that consultation.

COMPLETING THE SURVEY

Please complete only ONE SURVEY PER HOUSEHOLD. It would be a great help if as many people as possible could complete the survey online - go to www.martlesham2028.org.uk. As an incentive, if you COMPLETE THE SURVEY ONLINE, you will be entered into a PRIZE DRAW TO WIN £100.

If you are unable to complete the survey online, please give us your views by completing this PAPER SURVEY form. As a thank you for completing the survey, you will be entered into a PRIZE DRAW TO WIN £25. (Please note, you can only be entered into one draw and you will need to provide your contact details at the end of the survey.)

If you have any problems completing the survey, please contact Martlesham Parish Council office on 01473 612632. The project team preparing the Plan and conducting this survey, is made up of volunteers from the community and some Martlesham parish councillors.

SURVEY COLLECTION

Our collectors will be calling on **Saturday 27th September**, so please leave your envelope outside your home ready for collection. If you will be away that day, you may also drop it in one of the collection boxes (listed at the end of the survey) by Saturday 4th October.

PUBLICATION OF RESULTS

The results of the survey will be published on line at www.martlesham2028.org.uk with highlights in the Martlesham Monthly during November 2014.

NOW is the time for YOU to help shape the future of Martlesham. The greater the response to this questionnaire, the greater the credibility of the Neighbourhood Plan.

(Before it can be legally adopted, you will be able to comment on it and there will be a public referendum in 2015.)

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

* 1. Has anyone in your household completed an online questionnaire for this survey?

Yes No

If YES, please leave your envelope outside your door on 27th September with the online option ticked. You don't need to complete this paper copy as well. If NO, please continue with the survey.

HOUSING NEEDS

2. How likely is it you that will move house within the next 15 years? (Tick all that apply)

	Very likely	Possibly	Unlikely	Don't know
Within Martlesham	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Elsewhere	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. Please indicate below the size of dwelling you currently occupy and, if you are likely to move home within Martlesham in the next 15 years, what size of home you would be looking for. (Please tick those options which apply, both in terms of size and type of dwelling. Leave second column blank if you are not expecting to move.)

	Current home	New home in Martlesham
One bedroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Two bedrooms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Three bedrooms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Four bedrooms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Five bedrooms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bungalow	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
House	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sheltered housing (independent living with support)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mobile home/caravan/houseboat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you ticked other, please specify

4. If you are thinking of moving away from Martlesham, what are the main reasons? (Tick all that apply)

Family needs Education related Downsizing
 Work changes Transport issues No plans to move away

Other (please specify)

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

5. Do you think there is sufficient housing in Martlesham of the right size, type and tenure to meet the needs of older residents?

Yes

No

Uncertain/Don't know

6. If you think more accommodation for older people is needed in Martlesham, what type of accommodation do you think should be provided?

	Yes	No	Don't know
More sheltered housing (independent living with support)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Residential care home for elderly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accessible housing for disabled people	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More bungalows/smaller housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Any other suggestions or comments about accommodation needs to suit older people in Martlesham

LAND ALLOCATION AND HOUSING DESIGN

7. As in other parts of the country, housing growth in our area is inevitable. Adastral Park could meet the future housing target for this area if it goes ahead. However, if it doesn't, where in Martlesham should additional housing developments be built?

8. What housing styles would be best for new house building in Martlesham over the next 15 years? (Tick any you agree with and leave others blank)

	Individual houses built among existing (infill)	Larger housing developments
Similar style to existing developments/neighbouring houses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In keeping with traditional rural Suffolk styles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Modern urban designs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Innovative individual housing styles/materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accommodate a wide range of building styles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify)

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

9. In future housing developments, what maximum building heights should be allowed?

	2 storeys	3 storeys	4 storeys	5 storeys	6 storeys
Houses	<input type="radio"/>				
Flats	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>				

10. Apart from bigger housing developments, which of the following, if any, do you feel would improve Martlesham over the next 15 years? (Tick all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> More 'infill' housing | <input type="checkbox"/> New community/ leisure facilities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> More businesses | <input type="checkbox"/> New open space/woodlands |
| <input type="checkbox"/> More shops | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

If you ticked Other, please specify

11. If you ticked any of the above, where should they be located?

More businesses	<input type="text"/>
More shops	<input type="text"/>
New community/ leisure facilities	<input type="text"/>
New open space/ woodlands	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>

12. The visibility of buildings in the landscape can be changed by using or creating contours in the land and natural growth (trees, etc). This is known as visual screening. How important do you think this is for new developments?

- Very important Quite important Not important Uncertain/don't know

Comments about current visual screening

13. There are planning guidelines for new developments, but we may have the opportunity to modify these. Please tick any of the following that you would be in favour of.

- Stricter renewable targets such as energy efficiency requirements
- Increased density of houses (e.g. taller houses, more flats, smaller gardens)
- Lower density of houses (bigger gardens, more communal spaces) - means building on more area for the same number of homes
- A greater proportion of smaller homes

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

14. Martlesham Heath has a number of legal restrictions (covenants) designed to maintain the attractiveness of the area. For example, its residents are not allowed to store boats and caravans on residential streets or their driveways. To encourage a similar approach in new developments, should designated space be allocated in Martlesham for any of the following? (This could mean providing storage areas away from houses and/or extra car parking bays.)

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Boat storage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Caravan/motor home storage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Commercial vehicle parking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Extra parking spaces for residents and their visitors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Any comments if you are currently affected by any of the above

15. Are there any other requirements you would like to see for new developments which will help maintain the attractiveness of residential areas?

16. Do you have issues or concerns about any of the following?

	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely/ Never	Don't know
Road noise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Night-time noise from nearby business plant/equipment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Air quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overhead cables	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Risk of local flooding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you have issues or concerns about the above or any similar environmental issues, please explain.

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

17. Do you have any issues or concerns about lighting (e.g. light pollution or insufficient lighting)?

	Not concerned	Slightly concerned	Very concerned	Don't know/ N/A
Street lighting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Commercial signage (advertising)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Commercial security lighting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you have issues or concerns, please explain.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

18. Is your current internet speed sufficient for your needs?

- Yes No Don't know / N/A

19. If you were considering moving house, how important would a fast internet connection be to you?

- Very important Quite important Not important Don't know / N/A

Any comments about your internet requirements

20. Is there a need for public toilets to be provided in Martlesham?

- Yes No Don't know

21. If you answered yes to public toilets, where would be the best location, in your view?

- Martlesham Heath village centre near the shops
- Martlesham near the Black Tiles post office
- Martlesham near Crown Point
- Martlesham Main Road
- Martlesham retail area on the industrial estate

Other (please specify) or further comments

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

22. If allotments were provided in Martlesham, would you apply for one?

Yes

No

Don't know

If so, where would be the ideal location?

LEISURE ACTIVITIES

Photos of village halls, play spaces and some green open spaces can be seen here: <http://tinyurl.com/martlesham>

23. If you use any of the following community buildings (village halls), are they suitable for your needs?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Martlesham Heath Pavilion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Richards Room	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Martlesham Community Hall	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Old Martlesham Village Hall	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If they are not suitable, please explain your requirements

24. If you feel there is a need for additional community buildings, what type and where should they be located?

25. Which of the recreation areas below, if any, are used by children in your household (or regular visitors)? (Only tick those that apply. Skip this question if not relevant to your family/visitors.)

	Pre-school children	Age 5-11	Age 12-18
Jubilee Play Space (at the rear of Carol Ave by Beacon Hill School)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Diamond Jubilee Bike Trails (BMX dirt jumps)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Harry Higgins (adjacent to Martlesham Heath Pavilion)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Centenary Play Area (near Gorseland School)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Martlesham Recreation Ground (near the Creek)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>		

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

26. Do these play areas meet your children's needs? (Only answer in relation to those facilities that are relevant for the ages of your family/visitors.)

	Meets our needs	Needs improvement
Jubilee Play Space (at the rear of Carol Ave by Beacon Hill School)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Diamond Jubilee Bike Trails (BMX dirt jumps)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Harry Higgins (adjacent to Martlesham Heath Pavilion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Centenary Play Area (near Gorseland School)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Martlesham Recreation Ground (near the Creek)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Suggestions for improvement to children's recreation facilities

27. Some communities have created outdoor recreation areas and facilities such as woodland exercise or play features, sculpture parks, sensory trails, accessible woodland paths for wheelchair users, etc. which can be enjoyed by all ages including disabled people. Do you feel anything like this would be appropriate for Martlesham?

Yes

No

Don't know

If so, what would you like to see and where would be the best location, taking account of the needs of users and residents?

28. Do you think there are sufficient leisure facilities for teenagers living in Martlesham?

Yes

No

Don't know

Age 13 - 15

Age 16 - 19

If not, what would you suggest and where would be the best location?

SPORTS FACILITIES

From a planning point of view, we are interested to know what facilities may be needed to support the types of activities our residents enjoy. The list does not include sports and activities which could not easily be provided in a village environment such as sailing, motor sports, ice skating, etc.

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

29. Where (if at all) do members of your household take part in any of the following sports/activities?

(Only tick those which apply, leave blank if you no one in your household plays these sports)

	Within Martlesham	Elsewhere due to lack of facilities in Martlesham	Elsewhere for other reasons
Athletics/track sports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Badminton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bowls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Boxing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cricket	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exercise/keep fit classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Football	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Golf	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hockey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Martial arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rugby	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Squash	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Swimming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Table tennis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tennis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>		

30. If a sports hall could be provided in Martlesham, would you make use of it?

Yes

Possibly

No

Don't know / N/A

Any comments about the possible provision of a sports hall in Martlesham

31. If you think any other type of sports facility could be provided in Martlesham, please explain what's needed.

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

OPEN SPACES AND WOODLAND

32. Which public open spaces do members of your household value and/or use? (Please tick all that apply)

	Value as an asset	Informal activities	Dog walking	Organised sport	Route to destination	Other
Martlesham Common near Tesco	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Western Corridor, Martlesham Heath	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Northern Green, Martlesham Heath	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Village Green, Martlesham Heath	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Control Tower Green, Martlesham Heath	<input type="checkbox"/>					
End of Black Tiles Lane	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Martlesham Recreation Ground	<input type="checkbox"/>					

If you said other, please specify

33. Which woodlands do members of your household value as an important asset for Martlesham? (Please tick all that apply)

- Portal woods (between the Control Tower and Suffolk Police HQ)
- Martlesham Heath central woodlands (south of The Green)
- Wooded area adjacent to Mayfields, Martlesham Heath
- Woods between each hamlet on Martlesham Heath
- Wooded area alongside Dobbs Lane
- Dr Britain's Wood (Walk Farm, opposite Martlesham Community Centre)
- Sluice Wood (by Martlesham Creek)
- Woods near Private Road, Martlesham

Other wooded areas not mentioned above (please specify)

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

34. How important do you think it is to maintain open spaces between the following built up areas?

	Very important	Quite important	Not important	Uncertain	Don't know
Martlesham and Kesgrave	<input type="radio"/>				
Martlesham and Woodbridge	<input type="radio"/>				
Martlesham Heath and old Martlesham	<input type="radio"/>				
Martlesham and Waldringfield/Newbourne	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>				

35. Any comments about open spaces and woodlands in Martlesham

LOCAL SHOPS

36. Do members of your household use the shops/retail businesses in these locations?

	Regularly	Occasionally	Rarely/Never
The Square, Martlesham Heath	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Black Tiles	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J's Fish & Chips at Crown Point	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Martlesham Retail Park (e.g. Tesco, Next, M&S)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Martlesham businesses in the industrial units	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sandy Lane	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bridge Farm business area (near railway bridge)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

37. If you shop in Martlesham, how do you get there? (Only answer for shopping areas you visit. Tick all that apply.)

	Motor vehicle (car etc.)	Cycle	Walk	Public Transport
The Square, Martlesham Heath	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Black Tiles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
J's Fish & Chips at Crown Point	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Martlesham Retail Park (e.g. Tesco, Next, M&S)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Martlesham businesses in the industrial units	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sandy Lane	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bridge Farm business area (near railway bridge)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please suggest any access improvements e.g. parking/footpaths/cycle ways

38. Do you welcome the growth of national stores moving to the Martlesham retail park?

- Yes Partially No Don't know

Please explain why

39. If you think there is a need for additional retail provision in Martlesham, what type of shops/outlets would you be in favour of and where should they be located?

40. Suffolk Coastal DC has a policy that planning decisions about requests for retail outlets on the Martlesham industrial estate must consider their impact on shops in Woodbridge town centre. How important is it to have a similar policy in our Neighbourhood Plan to protect the viability of the existing smaller independent shops (two of which also provide post office services) in Martlesham?

- Very important Important Not important Don't know

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

TRANSPORT

41. Which transport methods do members of your household use most often to the destinations listed?
(Tick all transport methods usually used. Ignore those used very occasionally. Note: the Park & Ride option only applies to Ipswich)

	Private motor transport	Park and Ride (Ipswich only)	Bus (not the P&R)	Bicycle	Don't visit
Ipswich	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Woodbridge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Felixstowe	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify)

42. For people in your household who commute regularly to work or for study, where is their main destination starting from Martlesham? (Tick all the destinations members of your household commute to. Skip this question if no one commutes regularly.)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Martlesham | <input type="checkbox"/> Colchester |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Kesgrave | <input type="checkbox"/> Bury St Edmunds |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Woodbridge | <input type="checkbox"/> Norwich |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Felixstowe | <input type="checkbox"/> London |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ipswich | |

Other (please specify)

43. What mode of transport do members of your household routinely use to travel to work or for study?
(Select the transport used for significant parts of the journey - tick all that apply. Skip this question if no one commutes regularly.)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Car | <input type="checkbox"/> Motorbike |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bus | <input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Train | <input type="checkbox"/> Walking |

Other (please specify)

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

44. To what extent do you agree with the following?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ N/A
The current provision of public transport is adequate for future growth proposed in the area	<input type="radio"/>				
More buses are needed to/from Woodbridge	<input type="radio"/>				
More buses are needed to/from Felixstowe	<input type="radio"/>				
More <u>direct</u> buses are needed to/from Ipswich centre/station	<input type="radio"/>				
More <u>direct</u> buses are needed to/from key locations around the edge of Ipswich	<input type="radio"/>				
More dedicated bus lanes are needed to speed journeys	<input type="radio"/>				

Other comments

TRAFFIC

45. To what extent do you have any issues or concerns about the following?

	Very concerned	Concerned	Slightly concerned	Not concerned	Unsure
Difficulty in joining onto the A12	<input type="radio"/>				
Traffic speed	<input type="radio"/>				
Parking in the retail/industrial area	<input type="radio"/>				
Volume of traffic	<input type="radio"/>				

Please explain any issues or concerns including about any similar matters

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

46. Do you think traffic calming measures would significantly improve pedestrian/cyclist safety in any of the following locations?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Main Road Martlesham	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eagle Way, Martlesham Heath	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Old Felixstowe Road (behind Tesco)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Through the industrial estate near retail areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Any other suggestions or comments about traffic calming measures needed in Martlesham

FOOTPATHS, CYCLE WAYS AND TRACKS

An extensive system, of interconnected paths, paved cycle ways and unmade tracks, is located in and around Martlesham Heath. These also link up with paths, cycle ways and tracks to other parts of Martlesham, Kesgrave and other locations.

47. How often do members of your household use the following?

	Regularly	Sometimes	Rarely/never
Paved footpaths (excluding pavements alongside roads)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unmade tracks and paths	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Marked cycle paths (which may be shared with pedestrians)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cycle lanes on roads	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

48. If members of your household use footpaths and cycle ways, please give us your views on the following. (If not, please skip to next question)

	Yes	No	Don't know N/A
Are shared pedestrian/cycle paths clearly marked?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are footpaths and cycle ways adequately illuminated at night?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Is safe access across the A12 an issue for you?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain any issues or concerns you have with footpaths and cycle ways.

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

49. Are pedestrian and cycle routes connecting these locations to Martlesham adequate?

	Yes	Partially	No	Don't know/ N/A
Kesgrave	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ipswich	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Felixstowe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Woodbridge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If not, please give any suggestions for improvement

50. How satisfied are you with cycling facilities currently available in Martlesham?

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know / N/A
Provision of cycle lanes on roads	<input type="radio"/>				
Illumination of road cycle lanes	<input type="radio"/>				
Clear marking of road cycle lanes	<input type="radio"/>				
Parking for cycles	<input type="radio"/>				

Suggestions for improvement

ANY OTHER COMMENTS

51. If you have any further comments/concerns you'd like to tell us about planning-related topics for Martlesham, including any we haven't asked about (e.g. schools, nurseries, GP surgeries, recycling, small businesses, etc.), please tell us here. (Please continue on page 18 if necessary.)

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

ABOUT YOU

Responses to the next set of questions will enable us to sort responses into different groups, e.g. to help us understand more about what affects households living in the different parts of Martlesham or households with children or older residents. This grouping will be done automatically by computer so no one will be able to identify individual households from this information.

*** 52. Which area of Martlesham do you live in? (This is a compulsory question, as it helps us understand more about what affects different parts of our village.)**

- Martlesham Heath (includes Deben Ave)
- Old Martlesham (east of A12 including Sandy Lane)
- Falcon Park / Hilton Road
- California / Dukes Park
- Seckford Heights area
- Other (please specify)

53. Please enter your postcode here:

54. Which of the following best describes your household? (It's impossible to cover every combination, so please just pick the closest description.)

- Adults - working age
- Adults - mainly retired
- Adults - working age and retired
- Family with young children
- Family with teenage children
- Family with young and teenage children
- Family with children and retired adults

Other (please specify)

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

THANK YOU

Thank you for completing this survey. We really appreciate the time you have taken.

If you are unable to leave your completed survey form outside your door for collection on 27th September for any reason, please drop it into one of our collection boxes by Saturday 4th October. These are located in:

- Black Tiles Lane Post Office
- McColl's in The Square, Martlesham Heath
- the Falcon Park reception office.

The results of this survey can be viewed on the Neighbourhood Planning website **www.martlesham2028.org.uk** from November 2014.

Please note: you must leave your contact details (including your address) on the final page if you wish to be entered into the prize draw.

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CONTINUED

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

PRIZE DRAW ENTRY

55. If you wish to be entered into the £25 prize draw, please leave your details here, including your address. This information will be separated from the survey analysis - we will only use this to enter you in the draw and to make contact should you be our lucky winner.

Name:

First line of address:

Address 2:

Postcode:

Email Address (optional):

Phone Number:

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME AND FEEDBACK.

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

FEB 2013

WHAT SORT OF PLACE WILL MARTLESHAM BE IN 15 YEARS' TIME?

Now is your chance to shape the future by getting involved in the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan. Find out more at a Launch Event on Tuesday 19 March 2013, at 7.30pm in St Michael's Church Centre, Martlesham Heath (next to The Square). At this event you will hear more about the neighbourhood plan and how you can get involved. It will also be an opportunity to ask questions and to register your interest in getting involved in influencing the future of Martlesham. Please refer to our separate article in this newsletter for more information and look out for publicity in the coming months. **BOOK THE DATE IN YOUR DIARIES!**

MARCH 2013

What sort of place will Martlesham be in 15 years' time?

Do you want to know about Neighbourhood Planning?

As a resident of Martlesham do you want to influence how Martlesham looks and what facilities are available? A public meeting to explain neighbourhood planning is being held by your Parish Council – please come along.

Tuesday 19th March at 7.30pm in St Michael's Church Centre, Martlesham Heath

MAY 2013

Neighbourhood Plan

A public meeting was held on 19 March 2013 following the Council's decision to pursue a Neighbourhood Plan for Martlesham, if there was sufficient parishioner interest.

Approximately 140 people attended and on a show of hands a large majority thought we should proceed with a Neighbourhood Plan. 57 of those attending also expressed an interest in helping with the development of the plan. Meetings have been organised for those who expressed an interest in helping, these will have taken place by the time you read this. If you expressed an interest and have not been contacted by us, or you would like to be involved in any event, please let the Clerk know and a further meeting could be arranged.

JUNE 2013

Neighbourhood Plan

Over 30 people have offered to help with the Plan. They have been formed into groups together with a number of individual roles such as researcher and plan author. The Neighbourhood Plan teams are the plan team (comprising 4 Parish Councillors and 4 Parishioners) and six other plan area teams (Housing, Infrastructure, Recreation, Roads & Transport, and Environment). Each of the plan area teams has a representative on the plan team to enable overall coordination. This accounts for 6 of the plan team; the 7th member has responsibility for organising a joint review panel with representatives from neighbouring Parishes, MHHL, SCDC, and other relevant bodies. The 8th member is the team lead and has enough to do with that role alone! This update is purely on structure, by the time you read this all teams will have met and started work on the key issues. If you offered to help, and have not been contacted, or would like to help, please contact the Clerk.

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

JULY 2013

Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Teams have been holding meetings to start work on the key issues for our parish. Unfortunately the Business & Retail NP team is under resourced and we would like one or two people to join it to ensure we have a balanced view. The more people that are involved the better, so if you would like to help with any of the teams or hear more, please contact the Clerk.

AUGUST 2013

Neighbourhood Plan

The Plan Teams continue to meet but would still welcome more volunteers – please contact the Clerk if interested.

It is hoped that proposals on the Neighbourhood Plan Area will be sent to the District Council soon and this will then go out to consultation. The proposed plan area is our parish boundary plus areas of land in both Brightwell and Waldringfield which are included in the BT planning application site. Discussions have taken place with neighbouring parishes to gain their agreement and support.

SEPTEMBER 2013

Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan (NP)

On 31 July 2013 the Council submitted an application for the designation of the Neighbourhood Plan Area on behalf of the NP Team to Suffolk Coastal district Council (SCDC). The designation is for the entire parish of Martlesham, plus a section of Brightwell Parish and two very small parts of Waldringfield Parish in order to cover areas within the BT planning application boundary. Informal discussions were held with Brightwell and Waldringfield Parish Councils who indicated that they were content that we proceed on this basis. In due course SCDC will go out to consultation on our plan area for a 6-week period. The NP teams continue to meet and pool ideas. We'd really like younger people to engage with us too and tell us about their ideas for the future of Martlesham! Please contact the Clerk as there is still the opportunity to get involved. The plan teams will go out to the wider community to engage and test their ideas before pulling together the NP documents.

DECEMBER 2013

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN NEWS

The Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) is a golden opportunity for the residents and businesses within the Parish to have a major say in how Martlesham Parish will look for the next 15 years. Following the kick-off event in May we have formed a Neighbourhood Plan Team from volunteers and have been making progress on building the plan. The team have drafted a "Vision" which is a requirement and have been concentrating on the four areas we believe are important to Martlesham, namely environment, transport, housing and recreation. We have identified our likes and dislikes and are currently working towards the next stage of the plan. We are looking for volunteers, especially on the communications side, to give you the Parishioner's more awareness of what's going on and most importantly to get your input into the plan. If you are interested please email at martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk, and we'll get right back. If you've already offered to help, and we've not yet been in touch, we'll contact you over the next few weeks. We would like to hold another Parishioner's meeting soon, and hope to bring you more detail of the event in the January edition of the Martlesham Monthly.

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

JANUARY 2014

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE

The Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) is a golden opportunity for the residents and businesses within the Parish to have a major say in how Martlesham Parish will look for the next 15 years. Lots of news to report this month.

On January 23rd we will be holding a Neighbourhood Plan Meeting, for all Parishioner's, in St Michaels Church hall at 7.30pm. Come along to hear the latest news and more importantly to give us your thoughts for the Neighbourhood Plan. We want your thoughts and opinions on Transport, Housing, Environment and Recreation. We shall present what we have been doing and ask you to contribute your ideas so we can compile and pull it together into the plan. We shall also be asking for help to achieve the next stage of the plan so if you would like to assist we will be happy to welcome you into the team. If you cannot make the meeting on 23rd January and are interested in helping please email at martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk, and we'll get right back.

We now have a Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Facebook page. This is another way for you to give us your views of how you would like to see in the village develop. Log on to Facebook and enter Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan. We have contacted Kesgrave and Farlingaye schools asking them to encourage their Martlesham pupils to logon to our Facebook page and give us their views. We are also planning High school visits in the near future. You can also keep up to date at www.martlesham2028.org.uk.

MARCH 2014

A Winter's Tale

It was a wet and windy night, but despite this about 70 residents and volunteers turned up at St Michael's Church on 23rd Jan to hear about progress on the **Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan**, and to add their comments on issues that they would like the plan to consider.

A lot of people left comments about roads, cycleways, footpaths, A12 noise and pollution, and traffic volumes. Parking was a big concern - especially for new developments, as was access by foot and cycle to the new shops (Next, Tesco etc).

Traffic calming on Main Road and Eagle Way was mentioned, as was the high level of traffic on old Felixstowe Rd.

On housing, people were concerned about the design and height of future houses, with many feeling that they should blend in with existing housing styles and the countryside surroundings. The need for housing for young people was mentioned as was the need for more housing suitable for older people, plus retirement homes and a nursing home so our ageing population can remain local.

A number felt that preserving the character and open spaces of Martlesham Heath was important, as was having a policy to prevent unacceptable infill elsewhere.

The need for more accessible country areas close by was mentioned, as was more community open spaces in old Martlesham.

A new community hall in old Martlesham and proper youth community centre were both mentioned, as was a not for profit community cafe also selling local produce. Finally a common concern was the future of the surgery and the need for it to be able to expand in or near its current location to provide a wider range of services and cater for the ageing population. For more information about the event and the issues raised please visit our website at martlesham2028.org.uk or find us on Facebook. To get in touch by phone please leave a message by calling the Parish Council office on 01473 612632.

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

APRIL 2014

Last chance to shape Martlesham's future?

At the Christian Fellowship Hall in Black Tiles Lane on Tuesday 8th April between 7 and 8.30pm

This could well be your last chance to brief the team developing Martlesham's Neighbourhood Plan on how you would like our village to develop over the next 14 years. Those working on the plan will be available at the Christian Fellowship Hall in Black Tiles Lane between 7 and 8.30pm to discuss aspects including the design and height of new housing, the provision of shops, doctors' surgeries, schools and leisure facilities, roads, parking and public transport

Most importantly, they'll be there to hear your views. What sort of place do you want to live in? Do you want it to feel like a town or a village? How should leisure interests be catered for?

If you didn't come to one of the earlier consultation evenings, come and have your say! Can't make it and still want a say?

To find out more about what's going on and what people have told us so far, point your web browser at martlesham2028.org.uk. You can leave comments on our Facebook page or email us at martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk.

To contribute by phone, call 01473 612632 and leave a message with the Parish Council

JUNE 2014

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - UPDATE

Since our last communication we have held two drop- in sessions, for residents to give us their thoughts on how they want Martlesham to develop over the next 15 years. One in St Michael's church on the Heath and the other at the Christian Fellowship in Black Tiles lane. Feedback from both sessions has been very useful and will help us move to the next milestone of the Plan to produce a Survey.

To build a Neighbourhood Plan we need to survey all residents to get your views on what topics and policies should be in the Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan teams are currently working to produce input for the survey on the major topics on Transport, Housing , Environment and Recreation which concern you, to make it straightforward produce a plan. We are targeting the end of May to have an input draft in place ready to have the survey produced in time to issue to residents in July. We plan to distribute the survey to every door in the Parish by hand, it's a method that proved very successful in the past, so we shall need willing volunteers to help in this task. If you would like to help please give you name and contact details to our email address martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk, or by phone please leave a message by calling the Parish Council office on 01473 612632.

We are currently in discussions with Suffolk Coastal District Council on the best way we (the residents of Martlesham) can have influence on the Adastral development, either as part of the Neighbourhood Plan or not. Hope to have more news on that next month.

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

JULY 2014

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – UPDATE

Over the past month all efforts have been on progressing with the Neighbourhood Plan Survey. Based on the input from the earlier public meetings we now have a list of the topics you feel are important to address in the Neighbourhood Plan.

WE NEED YOUR HELP PLEASE

Our target is to distribute the Survey during July to all residents within the Martlesham Parish. The last survey in 2005 was a huge success. Surveys were hand delivered to each home and picked up three days later. We are proposing to use the same method in July but in order to do this we need the help of volunteers to hand deliver the surveys. If you are able to help us please give us your name and contact details either by emailing martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk or by calling the Parish Council office on 01473 612632. Each volunteer will have a survey pack which pinpoints the area they will cover along with the surveys and supporting information. We urgently need volunteers to make the survey delivery and collection as easy as possible.

Other news – We have had constructive discussions with Suffolk Coastal District Council on the Adastral development. They have given us written assurance that the local community will have a central part in how the development will look and blend into the existing surroundings should the development go ahead. Of course all progress on the Adastral development is currently on hold pending the existing legal challenge. We have been talking to other government agencies on how best to get the most out of the new development by working closely with the District Council and the Developer to produce a living environment which will benefit everyone in the Parish. More news on this next month.

SEPTEMBER 2014

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – UPDATE

In our last communication we were planning to have complete and have distributed the Neighbourhood Plan Survey. The survey will give us the blueprint for the improvements you the people of Martlesham want to see over the next 15 years. Unfortunately due to the holiday season we have been unable to complete the survey in July. We have revised our plan and are aiming to distribute the survey in September. There will be two methods of completion of the survey, by pen and paper and via the internet. To encourage completion of the survey we shall be awarding £25 prize for paper copy completion and £100 for internet completion, winners to be drawn out of a hat. We obviously encourage internet completion if possible to avoid the extra work of inputting the paper returns onto the internet version. WE NEED AS MANY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE TO COMPLETE THE SURVEY AS IT WILL DRIVE HOW MARTLESHAM WILL DEVELOP OVER THE NEXT 15 YEARS. THIS WILL BE YOUR LAST CHANCE TO HAVE YOUR SAY.

WE NEED YOUR HELP PLEASE TO DELIVER THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SURVEY

With our new target of September to distribute the Survey we shall need volunteers to help with the hand delivery of the survey and pick it up three days later. We need the help of volunteers . If you are able to help us please give us your name and contact details either by emailing martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk or by calling the Parish Council office on 01473 612632. Each volunteer will have a survey pack which pinpoints the area they will cover along with the surveys and supporting information. We urgently need volunteers to make the survey delivery and collection as easy as possible.

Other news – As you may have read recently the legal challenge over development of the BT Adastral site has ruled further hearings in the future. This will add further delay to the start of the development, assuming it gets approval.. We are continuing to work closely with Suffolk Coastal District Council on the Adastral development.

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

NOVEMBER 2014

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – UPDATE

Neighbourhood Plan Survey - As you are aware the Neighbourhood Plan Survey has been taking place over the past weeks. We now have all responses returned 47% online and 53% manually. The response has been truly outstanding with a total feedback of 920 surveys, 37%. This is an excellent return for a survey of this nature. Thank you all for participating and a special thank you for the people who helped with the distribution, collection and transferring of the surveys online, you made it happen. The next stage is to look at the data received and from your input identify the issues and wishes you want to see in the plan. This part of the process will take some time while we work on the information but given the approaching Winter holidays we will endeavour to share the results with you in a Public meeting in January. Watch this space for future dates.

Other news – Our discussions with Suffolk Coastal District Council on the potential Adastral development are making good progress. We have had constructive meetings with the District Planners and are very close to agreeing how we shall work together to plan the development if it is to go ahead. At this time the overall scheme remains on hold pending a court ruling planned for 21 January.

We are in the process of resubmitting our Neighbourhood Plan Boundary to match that of the Parish. This has been a longstanding debate but with confirmation from Suffolk Coastal we are confident this will be agreed in the coming weeks.

On a sad note I want to express our deepest sympathy to the family of John Foster. Sadly John passed away in early October. John was a friend, keen supporter and volunteer of the Neighbourhood Plan and he will be sorely missed by us all.

JANUARY 2015

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – UPDATE

Neighbourhood Plan Boundary – As directed by Suffolk Coastal District Council we resubmitted our Neighbourhood Plan Boundary to match that of the Parish Boundary on 17th October. At this time (11 Dec) we are still waiting for Suffolk Coastal to process the submission. We are consulting with government agencies as to how we should proceed.

Adastral development – In October our meetings with Suffolk Coastal District Council had made good progress. We had constructive meetings with the District Planners and were very close to agreeing how we shall work together to plan the Adastral development if it is to go ahead. Today we appear to be back to square one. SCDC are now refusing to produce a Memorandum Of Understanding as to how we shall work together. At this time the overall scheme remains on hold pending a court ruling planned for 21 January. We have done all we can to get an agreement with SCDC, once again we are seeking advice from government agencies on how we should proceed.

Neighbourhood Plan Survey - As previously reported the response to the survey was truly outstanding with a total return of 920 surveys, 37%. On 14-Nov we shared early results with the helpers who supported the distribution and collection of the survey. The survey draw results were declared and the winners of the online and paper survey draws received their prizes. We are now at the stage where we need guidance on how we should be analysing the survey results and subsequently turn them into policies for the plan. We are meeting with our consultant in early January to make progress.

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

MARCH 2015

Martlesham Monthly

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – UPDATE

Neighbourhood Plan Boundary – On 18-December 2014 we resubmitted our Neighbourhood Plan boundary area. Again matching the Parish Boundary but adding in additional input as suggested by “Locality.org” the Government agency that has been supporting us. Suffolk Coastal District Council accepted our submission on 26-January 2015 and the 6 week consultation period began, closes on 9-March. It so happens Woodbridge have also submitted a Neighbourhood Plan and have included the northern boundary of Martlesham. Suffolk Coastal will make the final decision but we have consulted with the local residents on 7-Feb in Seckford Heights, Dukes Park and California for their thoughts on which Neighbourhood Plan they would like to be a part of. More details on the boundary can be seen on our website <http://martleshamnp.onesuffolk.net/>

Adastral development – The Court ruling went ahead on 22 January, however, the Judge is considering his decision. At time of writing (7 Feb) we expect a decision to be made in approx 2 weeks' time. Regarding a Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) with Suffolk Coastal District Council about community involvement in the design and planning of Adastral Park, we don't expect any progress prior to the legal decision.

Neighbourhood Planning – We met with our planning consultant on 5-Feb. Using our survey results we shall be identifying the top items we need to address as part of our Neighbourhood Plan and provide evidence. This will involve collecting additional information from various sources. We are in need for support from the local community. If you are able to volunteer your time to help us please contact us through the Martlesham Parish Clerk on 01473 612632 or email us at martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk

MAY 2015

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE

The residents' survey results have been summarised and priorities identified. Please see our web site (martlesham2028.org.uk) for details.

Separately, residents of Martlesham North Ward were invited to submit their preference of whether to be included in the Martlesham or Woodbridge neighbourhood plans. (This won't affect the fact their homes are still in Martlesham.) Sadly, very few households in the affected area chose to comment, but the majority of these said they preferred to be included in the Woodbridge Plan and this has now been agreed by all parties, subject to a formal response by Suffolk Coastal DC. As a result, the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan area will now cover the Martlesham Parish boundary excluding North Ward (Seckford Heights, Duke's Park, California and the site of the Woodbridge Football Club).

Are you interested in joining the Martlesham neighbourhood planning team? We badly need help with the following:

- making decisions on which issues should be covered by policy statements
- research and evidence gathering
- publicity and engaging the wider community

We would be very grateful for any help you can give us. Please contact us through the Martlesham Parish Clerk - 01473 612632 or email us at martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

JUNE 2015

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE

On the 5th May 2015 Suffolk Coastal District Council refused the Martlesham neighbourhood area application which followed the Parish boundary. However SCDC approved an amended area. Their exclusions include:

1. Land now incorporated within the Woodbridge (with part of Martlesham) neighbourhood plan area (Dukes Park, California, Seckford Heights and Woodbridge FC site).
2. Land included within the strategic planning application (C/09/0555) Adastral Park (the whole of the BT site plus development land to the south and east).

The Decision Notices can be viewed via the following link:

<http://www.suffolkcoastal.gov.uk/yourdistrict/planning/policy/community/consultation/>

With reference to Adastral Park the Decision Notice states that "Any grant of planning permission will be subject to a condition requiring a masterplan to be produced. The community would have input into the masterplan.....The combined neighbourhood plan / masterplan approach is considered to provide a strong local input / influence and a strong framework to ensure the physical and social integration between existing and future communities, service provision and land uses over the next 15 to 20 years."

We intend to press for meaningful community involvement prior to any planning consent being given.

The planning application is now some 6 years old and much has changed since then (for example the emergence of a much busier retail park). There are also issues that were not covered in the planning application, but which came up later in the Local Plan inspection - eg mitigating open spaces, country park availability etc.

As Martlesham evolves and grows we will endeavour to preserve the best of what already exists and harmoniously incorporate the new.

Email. Martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

JULY 2015

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Recreation Team - July 2015

Recreation, leisure and our environment are important factors in our quality of living in this area and the survey results reinforced how appreciated and valued these facilities are.

Open Spaces and Woodlands

The survey response confirmed that these areas are widely used and much appreciated. We are working on creating policies which will protect these areas from development in the future.

Play Areas and Sports facilities

There are several Play Areas in the Parish and all are well used. There is however a need for updating and extending the range of equipment. Sports facilities are limited and we will try to encourage the provision of more equipment and possibly a sports centre.

Community Buildings

These all enjoy a very high occupancy and are acceptable for most uses. There is a need to update Old Martlesham village Hall. We will be looking to support the protection of existing facilities now and in the future.

Environment

We will be looking to reduce noise and air pollution from traffic and lighting. Create policies which encourage use of footpaths and cycle paths.

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

OCTOBER 2015

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Work is still ongoing for the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan including a survey of businesses in the Parish. With most of the information now collected we are now compiling the policies to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan, which will help to shape development in the area for the next 15 years.

Have you made sure your feelings /views have been made?

Earlier we tried to engage with the teenagers of Martlesham with a specific online survey for teenagers at Kesgrave and Farlingaye schools. Although there was a limited response, the information feedback was useful and did suggest teenagers would like more local sports facilities and a better and more reliable bus service as most still rely on car lifts to travel. If you are aged between 12 and 18 and were not aware of the survey and would still like to contribute we would appreciate your comments and views regarding the facilities in the area for sports, leisure, and any concerns you may have regarding the local environment, traffic and travelling

You can let us have your comments by use of any of the following:- Email

martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk

www.martlesham2028.org.uk

Find us on Facebook

Leave a message at the council office 01473 612632

NOVEMBER 2015

Neighbourhood Plan (NP)

Councillors and volunteers have been working hard on issues that affect our parish. They have been successful in gaining some further government grant funding to help pay for the work involved in consulting with parishioners and producing local policies. A business survey was undertaken recently with efforts to engage more effectively with the many businesses in our area. It is hoped that we will be in a position to go out to referendum by the autumn of next year, with a published plan by the end of 2016. New helpers are always welcomed! Here are the contact details:

Email martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk

www.martlesham2028.org.uk

Find us on Facebook

Leave a message at the council office 01473 612632

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

DECEMBER 2015

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

In our recent survey we asked residents if they had concerns about traffic speeds within the parish. We received over 800 replies to this question of which 71% had some concerns with 24% expressing strong concern. Paradoxically when we asked a question as to whether residents would welcome the introduction of traffic calming measures to reduce the problem the majority were against such an idea. This was an unexpected finding.

Puzzling over this difference we wonder if residents have assumed that traffic calming implies speed bumps. Whilst these are a means of introducing traffic calming they are far from the only way of achieving a reduction in traffic speed. Alternatives include flashing speed sensitive signs, road layout changes to force vehicles to slow down, polite notices and others.

We would welcome your views on traffic calming measures and any suggestions you might have to make our parish a safer place in which to live.

Do you have experience of Desk Top Publishing? Would you be willing to volunteer to help us put together the draft Neighbourhood Hood Plan for publication and comment?

Please contact :

Email martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk www.martlesham2028.org.uk

MARCH 2016

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The work done by the team is now starting to bear fruit. The general surveys of residents and business, combined with the public meetings, liaison with major employers and landowners and specialised contact with particular interest groups have identified a growing consensus on what developments should be allowed in Martlesham.

As regards housing the feeling is that Martlesham is doing more than its bit to accommodate new housing in the Adastral, Bloor homes and possibly the Woodbridge Football Club (which is within the area being covered by the Woodbridge Neighbourhood Plan) sites.

Furthermore any smaller scale infill like developments should only be allowed if they meet the needs of the local community which is short of smaller and affordable properties and if they do not adversely affect existing residents.

These views on housing policies were sent to the Parish Council's Development Plans Committee when it was discussing the application from Gladmans to develop land south of Dukes Park off Sandy Lane and we are pleased to report these emerging policies chimed well with other representations and helped to inform the response of the Committee to these proposals.

We would particularly like to hear from any residents who have not yet given their input into the plan, particularly younger people and efforts continue to reach these groups.

Comments can be left via the website, martlesham2028.org.uk/ email <mailto:martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk> or find us on facebook. If you have issues requiring attention, but are not related to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan please contact the Parish Council direct

On the wider front policy proposals for housing, transport, environment, recreation, leisure and businesses are nearing completion and further work is ongoing to finalise these.

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

MAY 2016

Pedestrians _____ Cyclists _____ Users of Mobility Scooters

Could you spare some time to share your experience of getting around the Martlesham Retail Park?

Any comments will help us provide evidence for our Neighbourhood Plan .

Points of contact:

Written notes addressed to Martlesham NP PPT – can be posted or delivered to Martlesham Parish Office, Felixstowe Road, IP12 4PB

E-Mail: martlesham2028@gmx.co.uk

Facebook: The community page is available on Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan: Martlesham 2028

JULY 2016

Neighbourhood Plan (NP) update

A draft plan has been prepared and the NP team has engaged a planning consultant to finalise it. On the basis of all the public consultations to date, the Neighbourhood Plan will propose that the current physical limits of the built up areas of Martlesham remain the same and therefore any applications for developments outside the village envelope should be rejected. It is hoped that this will be accepted by the District Council. The plan will ultimately go out to referendum for approval by the whole parish. For more information see the NP website: <http://martleshamnp.onesuffolk.net/>

NOVEMBER 2016

Protecting Martlesham Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Your opportunity to comment Following extensive research and consultations with residents, businesses and major landowners the team has identified the policies needed to guide future developments in Martlesham.

These now need to be scrutinised by the community to make sure they are what we need. Therefore a period of consultation will start in mid November and end at the end of January. A longer period than legally required because of Christmas. At the start of the period the draft neighbourhood plan will become available electronically from the website, (<http://martleshamnp.onesuffolk.net/>) with opportunities to comment and the December Martlesham Monthly will contain a substantial summary and further opportunities to comment.

Throughout the period the team will be undertaking further activities to enable every voice to be heard. Public displays and drop in sessions already arranged, to which you are invited are:

- Tuesday 6th December Martlesham Primary Academy (Beacon Hill) 4.00 – 7.00
- Monday 12th December Parish Room (Community Centre, Felixstowe Road) 4.00 – 7.00
- Thursday 15th December Church Centre, (Martlesham Heath) 4.30 – 7.30
- Monday 30th January 2017 Parish Room (Community Centre, Felixstowe

Road) 4.00 – 7.00

We will also be pleased to be invited to any club, society or other group in Martlesham to

MARTLESHAM MONTHLY ARTICLES

present our plans and listen to your views.

The areas covered in the plan can be summarised as:

- Vision for the future of Martlesham
- Housing
- Recreation, leisure, services and environment
- Getting around
- Commercial and retail

At the end of the consultation period we will amend the plan and policies as necessary before they are further independently examined and then subjected to a referendum to guarantee they represent the wishes of the community.

DECEMBER 2016

Working Together to Secure the Future of Martlesham Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Consultation in Full Swing

Please check the insert you received with this magazine which gives full details of the consultation process which is now taking place. Please leave a message at the parish office (01473 612632) if you did not get your copy.

Your views are vital to the success of the plan which relates to new planning policies for most of Martlesham. It has been prepared by a working party of local volunteers and parish councillors

At the start of the period the draft neighbourhood plan became available electronically from the website, (<http://martleshamnp.onesuffolk.net/>) and every household and business in Martlesham will receive a brochure with the key points summarised. Please consider what is proposed and let the team know your views, either electronically or in paper form.

Written comments can be left at McColls, Black Tiles Post Office, Falcon Park reception or the Parish Offices

MARCH 2017

Thank you to all those who responded to our consultation which ran for ten weeks until the end of January; in total we had one hundred responses. The vast majority of these came from residents, with the remainder from other councils, developers, landowners and government bodies. The quality and quantity of the responses from residents shows the deep interest we all share in protecting what we have for the future. Such a solid response will go a long way to ensuring the credibility and effectiveness of the plan once it is finally made.

By the time you read this, work will be well advanced on incorporating your comments into a revised plan, upon which all residents will be entitled to vote before it comes into force. Some responses expressed unhappiness that many of the problems facing the parish (e.g. existing parking problems) were not dealt with in the plan, but were "relegated" to the end as "Non - Policy Actions". We should have explained more clearly that the neighbourhood plan itself deals with how future developments should be dealt with; existing problems need a different remedy. As a separate issue, individuals and groups which make up the community need to find ways of tackling these existing problems.

PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTEES

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14)

As part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2015 (as amended), Martlesham Parish Council is undertaking Pre-Submission Consultation on the Martlesham Draft Neighbourhood Plan. As a body we are required to consult, and we are hereby seeking your views on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

The Pre-Submission Consultation Document, together with information on how to respond, are on the [Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan website](#).

This Pre-Submission Consultation runs for a period of 12 weeks starting on **14 November 2016**. The closing date for representations is **31 January 2017**.
(NB the statutory minimum consultation period is 6 weeks)

Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Team

www.martlesham2028.org.uk

Facebook <https://www.facebook.com/martleshamnp>

Phone messages may be left with Martlesham Parish Council
01473 612632

PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTEES - CONTINUED

Pre-submission consultation - Landowners, statutory consultees and other relevant bodies contacted	
Adrian Johnson - Sandy Lane	sent by post
Anglian Water	sbull@anglianwater.co.uk
Brightwell Parish Council	angiebugs2001@yahoo.co.uk
British Telecom	sally.leonard@bt.com
CEG	david.lewis@ceg.co.uk
Councillor Caroline Page	caroline.page@suffolk.gov.uk
Councillor Christopher Hudson	christopher.hudson@suffolk.gov.uk
Councillor Colin Hedgley	colin.hedgley@suffolkcoastal.gov.uk
Councillor Geoff Lynch	Geoff.Lynch@east suffolk.gov.uk
Councillor Patricia Mulcahy	patricia.mulcahy@suffolkcoastal.gov.uk
Councillor Patricia O'Brien	patricia.obrien@suffolk.gov.uk
Councillor Robert Whiting	robert.whiting@suffolk.gov.uk
Councillor Sue Mower	Sue.Mower@east suffolk.gov.uk
Councillor Tony Fryatt	tony.fryatt@suffolkcoastal.gov.uk
County Rights of Way	prow.east@suffolk.gov.uk
David Lock Associates	pchambers@davidlock.com
Deben Estuary Partnership	sent to Suffolk Coasts And Heaths - see below
English Heritage	david.grech@english-heritage.org.uk
Environment Agency	andrew.hunter@environment-agency.gov.uk
Fordley Land Company (own MH village square)	(managing agent for Fordley)
Gladman Developments Ltd	info@gladmans.co.uk
Graingers	info@graingerplc.co.uk + brettgirling@btinternet.com
Greenways	info@communityactionsuffolk.org.uk
Highways England	planningee@highwaysengland.co.uk
Hilary Hanslip	Hilary.Hanslip@east suffolk.gov.uk
Historic England	eastplanningpolicy@historicengland.org.uk
Homes and Communities	nhi.huynh-ma@homesandcommunities.co.uk
Kesgrave Town Council	enquiry@kesgravetowncouncil.org.uk
Little Bealings Parish Council	littlebealingspc@btinternet.com
London Metric Property PLC - Simon Meacock	info@londonmetric.com
Max Industrious	gevans@industrious.co.uk
Martlesham Heath Surgery	lynne.marsh@nhs.net
MHAS	martyn@talktalk.net + control.tower@mhas.org.uk
MHHL	mhh@martlesham.org.uk
Natural England	Alison.Collins@naturalengland.org.uk
Parochial Church Council	toby@martleshamcofe.org.uk
Peter Little Moon & Sixpence	info@moonandsixpence.eu
Police HQ	spcc@suffolk.pnn.police.uk
Portland Wood Conservation Group	pwcg.martlesham@gmail.com
SCC	robert.feakes@suffolk.gov.uk - now james.Cutting@suffolk.gov.uk
SCDC	Geoff.Holdcroft@east suffolk.gov.uk
Suffolk Coast and Heaths	schaonb@suffolk.gov.uk
Tenter Property Management (see Grainger)	brettgirling@btinternet.com
Therese Coffey	office@Conservative-SuffolkCoastal.co.uk
Waldringfield Parish Council	pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com
Woodbridge Town Council	chris@woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk

CONSULTATION EVIDENCE HELD BY PARISH COUNCIL

EVIDENCE OF CONSULTATION AVAILABLE ON OUR WEB SITE: MARTLESHAM 2028

TAB	ITEM
HOME	Vision Statement
	Formal Notice Pre-Submission Consultation
	Residential Survey (Archived data)
	Copy of Survey Form
NEWS	Draft NP Consultation 14.11.16 to 31.1.17
	December 2015 Newsletter
	October 2015 Newsletter
	August 2015 Newsletter
	Approval of NP Boundary
	Residential Survey Results
	Notice that Survey is now closed
	Notice that Household Survey to start on 13.9.14
	Kesgrave High School Logo Competition
	Notice of Public Meeting 8.4.14
	Drop in Session 29.3.14
	Martlesham Monthly Article – March 14
	Report of Public Meeting held 23.1.14
	Launch of Facebook Page Dec 13
	December 2013 Newsletter

CONSULTATION EVIDENCE HELD BY PARISH COUNCIL - CONTINUED

EVIDENCE OF CONSULTATION AVAILABLE AS HARD COPIES IN PARISH OFFICE

Parish Minutes	
Progress reports to Parish Council	
Filed Copies	
Minutes of NP Plan Team Meetings	
Boxed in Cupboard	
Completed Residential Survey Forms	
Business Survey Forms	
Martlesham NP Evidence Box File	
Presentation To Parish Council 12.12.12	Copy of presentation by Chris Bowden - Navigus
Public Meeting 19 th March 2013	Poster and insert – distributed through Martlesham Monthly Leo Brome - Report of Meeting Slide show presentation and notes List of attendees Summary of Indication of Interest Copy of press release EADT press cutting 28.1.13 Ipswich Star press cutting 14.3.13 EADT Press cutting 11.3.13
NP Team	Structure of Planning Team
NP Visioning Workshop 5-8-13	Timetable Presentation Summary of Flip Chart Notes made by Participants Notes from Environment Group Held before Visioning Workshop
A Vision for the Parish of Martlesham Working Draft	
Martlesham Parish Council Resolution C2013/4c	Facilitate the production of a NP and accept the Terms of Reference for the Steering Group
Martlesham Age	2011 Census data
Nant Survey 2009 Data	Initial guide to issues likely to be raised

CONSULTATION EVIDENCE HELD BY PARISH COUNCIL - CONTINUED

Public Meeting 23.1.14	Poster Copy of presentation Example of post it notes Summary report Feedback forms Query Form Volunteer Form Summaries of comments received and post-it notes Summary of comments that should be reviewed by Parish Council Post event review from Dr Bruce Boxall
Drop in Sessions 29 th March and 8 th April	Copy of poster Copy of letter hand delivered to residents in Martlesham North Ward Data Capture Forms Summary of attendance Summary of comments Summary of attendance of all 3 events
Martlesham Community Council	MCC ideas for incorporation in the NP
Martlesham Heath Householders	Response to NP from MHHL
Survey of Community Buildings Oct 2014	
Housing Team Evidence Gathering April 2014	Notes of visits to: Alice Grange Nursing Home Grove Court Nursing Home Seckford Almshouses Austwick Berry Estate Agent
Martlesham NP Household Survey	Copy of survey NP Survey delivery routes Draft results and summaries
Kesgrave School Survey Questions	
Recreation Team Analysis	
Martlesham Play Spaces Discussion Document	Copy forwarded to Martlesham Parish Council Recreation and Amenities Committee

CONSULTATION EVIDENCE HELD BY PARISH COUNCIL - CONTINUED

Industrial Consultation and Survey	Retail and Business Strategy Feb 14 Draft plan for evidence gathering Rationale for consultation questions Industrial Consultation Form Presentation of results from Industrial Survey Dec 2014 Data collated from Industrial Survey Dec 2014 Copy of letter hand delivered to all businesses inviting them to meeting on 29 th Sept 2015. Notes of meeting with Max Industrious 16 th Sept 2015 Note of meeting regarding Martlesham Heath Village Square with Will Barton (Managing agent for the owners) 8 th Jan 2015 Notes of meeting with Innovation at Adastral Park 13 th Jan 2015
Martlesham Monthly	Copy of articles Feb 2013 – March 2017 Copy of November 2016 Magazine Copy of e-mail from David Beaumont in response to article in August 2015
Draft Copy of Cycle & Pedestrian Strategy for Martlesham	A review of this document was carried out as part of the Martlesham NP
Heritage Assets	Suffolk County Council Monument Full Report British Listed Buildings Historic England List Entries Heritage Gateway
Newsletters distributed as insert with Martlesham Monthly	December 2013 August 2015

CONSULTATION EVIDENCE HELD BY PARISH COUNCIL - CONTINUED

Miscellaneous correspondence, meeting notes etc	<p>30.1.13 – Report to Parish Council 19.4.13 - E Mail from Hilary Hanslip 1.7.13 – Notes from Joint Meeting with SCDC, Great Bealings and Melton Parish Councils 1/10.13 – Report to Parish Council 16.10.13 – NP Programme 30.10.13 – Report to Parish Council 4.12.13 – Joint Parishes Meeting – SCDC, Melton, Woodbridge and Martlesham 12.11.13 – Notes of meeting with Navigus 9.1.14 – Background note for meeting on Martlesham Neighbourhood Area 26.9.14 – Letter from PRC on Martlesham emerging NP 20.11.14 – E-Mail from Church Youth Co-ordinator May 2015 – Copy of Press Release 3.8.15 – Email and response regarding traffic problems on the Retail Park 13.7.15 – Notes of meeting with BT representatives 5.8.15 – Copy of e-mail to Scout Commissioner Oct 2015 – Highways Register 18.11.15 Signed Service Level Agreement with SCDC 19.11.15 & 10.12.15 – E-mail and report on air quality 23.11.15 – Martlesham & Woodbridge NP Joint Liaison Meeting notes 3.12.15 – Notes of meeting with Tim Passmore 15.1.16 – Notes of meeting with Strategic Planner 16 and 18.2.16 – Email request and response - Lindsay Clubb- Graingers – History of Martlesham 14.3.17 – Notes of telephone discussion with Practice Manager – Martlesham Surgery</p>
Pre-Submission Consultation	<p>Copy of poster Copy of e-mail and list of statutory consultees Copy of Consultation arrangements issued as insert in Martlesham Monthly Copy of “Your Opportunity to Comment” letter and summary of draft NP hand delivered to all homes Copy of letter delivered to businesses with summary of draft NP List of Consultees Attendance sheets for 6th and 15th December</p>

**MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN:
PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14)
CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

SEE FOLLOWING PAGES

MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN: PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14) CONSULTATION COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
1	Environment Agency		<p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the Martlesham (Suffolk) Neighbourhood Development Plan. We have checked the constraints of the Neighbourhood Plan area and confirm that it is compliant and satisfactorily addresses the Environment Agency constraints within our limit.</p>	Comment used to inform SCDC for SEA	No change
2	Ludford		<p>The issues outside the scope of the plan seem to be the very things which should be included. How much reliance can be put on the publishers/planners when they seem to think that $\frac{1}{2}$ of the A12 is drive on the right.</p>	Error in inserting photograph in summary document (P10) – photo in draft NP correct.	No change
3	Georgiou	6.29	<p>It is incorrect to say that the small Drs surgery has limited potential to expand. If the surgery negotiated to buy the land, or rent on long lease, then the surgery could expand into the car park and provide a more modern surgery with additional health services and Doctors to support the rapidly growing population.</p> <p>5.7 and 5.8</p> <p>Clearly states we have insufficient properties suitable for older people. It follows therefore that any residential development on the "Doctor's" car park should be single storey bungalow properties suitable for older people. Older people downsizing will free up houses for families, this would also be in keeping with the current government's view on trying to get older people to downsize.</p>	Options discussed and wording of Policies MAR 3 and MAR 5 reviewed	Text amended
4	Mr R Pope		<p>Martlesham retail parking – this is proving woefully inadequate, commercial developments must have sufficient parking for customers and staff, Example: The recent arrival of Hobbycraft has shown that parking is not being taken seriously.</p> <p>Being a resident of Falcon Park (a private residential park for the Retired and semi retired of 200 plus homes) which has no public right of way. I am concerned that there is no mention of the protection of the security of residents of both Falcon Park and the area which we know as the old MOD housing. Falcon Park is bordered on two sides by a public footpath, one of which is open to access the Park by the public. This public footpath could possibly become a "short cut" to the Martlesham Heath Retail Park once the development (Adastral Park) progresses, and as such it could encourage people to use the Park road as opposed to the single public footpath. If there is no provision in place to change the current public footpath to a proper paved footpath, then I would like to be assured that a fence (suitable to match the environment) be installed alongside the current footpath to protect both the privacy of Falcon Park residents, and also the privacy of the residents of the</p>	Identified as a weakness 2.16 See MAR14,15,16 and Table 9.1 Non-policy actions	No change

5	Mr & Mrs CJ & AC Cubitt	old MOD housing area. We are not against the NP – however, if it is adopted, what “teeth/power” will the Parish Council have?	We highlight as an example the recent “Michael Howard Homes” development. The parish council objected as it was outside the physical limits and against the policies of the SCDC Local Plan, and John Kelso, District Councillor was of the same opinion = It gets approval: Would the Parish Council have the power to overturn such approval in the future with the NP? If not this needs to be clearly identified.	The emerging NP will be used to inform SCDC but any planning applications approved cannot be overturned. Noted
6	Smith	With new development, we understand the developer has to pay a % to SCDC for local communities, but this can be spent in a local community miles from the development, which is not having any development. This needs to be changed so the money is available to the area which is being developed, and for instance could be used for road or pedestrian access improvement at Anson Road land adjacent to Tesco – Felixstowe Rd . DC/16/2828/FUL – John Kelso Report.	The NP should indicate new development for residential must be in keeping with existing properties. I.E. Michael Howard is building 25 houses, when all Black Tiles/Chandos etc are bungalows.	National planning policy in the NPPF is less restrictive and permits innovative design. To require particular materials would be overly prescriptive and would conflict with national planning policy. Covered in MAR3, 4 and 5
7	Mr Dawdry	Fully appreciate the amount of work involved to collate all of the findings in such a vast amount of varying topics. We feel this plan is too late to affect an already established business and road structure and will have no sway in altering this to the residents' benefits.	We would like to add a complaint/urgent suggestion. The paths on Chandos Drive/Black Tiles Lane are severely affected by tree roots etc. and are inaccessible for wheelchair and elderly residents. Most have to walk in the road as the only flat surface. There is an accident waiting to happen.	Reported to SCDC Highways. No change

		With the new building opposite Black Tiles Lane and the very large proposed build of 2000 homes on Adastral Park, there seems to be no plan to improve road infrastructure, with already at peak times (now extending) long waits to gain access to the A1214 and to the A12 North and South. I also query to what measures and plans are to increase i.e. sewerage and other main domestic supplies.	02,04,05,06,11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17 Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and 9.1 Non Policy Actions	10391 – HL
8	Lowry	A traffic control link to Foxhall Road from Martlesham Heath is long overdue.	Covered in MAR 14	No change
9	Lesley & Peter Roberts	<p>On further thought – Pedestrian Crossings</p> <p>Following receipt of the Neighbourhood Plan we would like to make the following comments:</p> <p>Under the heading:- Housing – Strengths to be protected – there should be a third item:</p> <p>3. Protecting existing neighbourhoods from over-development i.e. back land development, tandem building and garden grabbing</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>This has clearly been demonstrated by planning permission being granted to build a property to the rear of No 6 Black Tiles Lane which sides onto Angela Close. Other nearby residents in Main Road have seen what financial gain there is on offer by selling off their back gardens and trying to gain access into Angela Close.</p> <p>To date there have been four planning permissions refused and another which went to appeal has also been refused and a further appeal is still outstanding.</p> <p>This has been very stressful for the majority of the residents of Angela Close who are totally against these proposals as it will alter our Street Scene resulting in cramped forms of development, out of character with the existing properties and will spoil what is a very pleasant, quiet Close to live in.</p> <p>The Parish Council has been supportive of our objections, therefore, we think the above additional statement or something similar should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Any specific policy which sought to restrict development within the settlement boundary would be in conflict with national planning policy.</p>	<p>No change</p>
10	Sheicot		<p>I would endorse all the findings and proposals under the following headings:</p> <p>Housing; Community Facilities; Open Spaces and Footpaths; Getting around and Industrial areas.</p> <p>I would like to emphasise the urgent need for much more additional parking particularly in the area of retail outlets which are currently totally inadequate,</p>	Identified as a weakness 2.16

		even for the current retail developments and what of the future?	See MAR14,15,16,17 and Table 9.1 Non-policy actions
		There is an urgent need for signage for the Industrial estate and a leaflet giving a plan of the Industrial estate together with the names and addresses of the companies.	Text amended MAR 3 reviewed plus refer to MAR 9,10 and 11
		Serious consideration must be given to the current and future infrastructure including the following: Medical facilities; Leisure facilities for all ages both indoor and outdoor; Small specialised Retail outlets,	Non Policy Actions are outside the scope of the NP policies
		Matters outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP)	
		It is stated on page 14 that items listed 1 -23 are outside the scope of the NP. I would suggest that many of these points should at some time in the not too distant future become an important part of the NP and residents should have the opportunity to express their opinions and be consulted, particularly with the new Adastral Park Development on the horizon.	
		Martlesham Heath where we live is a great design with an excellent mix of properties, which is enjoyed by us all.	Noted and wording reviewed.
11	Harris	I am concerned that "strongly supported" won't actually be translated to what will actually happen. It's easy to build housing anywhere and make a profit, it's not so easy to provide infrastructure. Our main concerns are traffic and we so desperately need a kick-a-about area as you mention in the plan. Give the young lads somewhere with goals to play football and they will be busy and happy for hours at a time! And, therefore not causing trouble elsewhere. Also use the existing play area by the pavilion but install new exciting equipment including some for the older ones. This park is well supported and would benefit from a re-vamp.	Text amended
12	Goddard	We are concerned there are no suitable crossing facilities for pedestrians and disabled people. Also heavy volumes of traffic and on road parking.	Identified as a weakness 2.16 See MAR14,15,16 and Table 9.1 Non-policy actions
13	Sims	Less buildings and more trees and open areas – we need wild life,	Existing areas protected by MAR 7 and 8
14	De Chi-Bryan	The present broadband speed has not been updated or in fact addressed despite promises from BT that the issue was to be resolved by 2016. I have had increasingly slower services as the years have progressed and there is always an excuse. There needs to be a strong commitment to ensuring that the optimum service is available. We are held to ransom as there is no other option. I would like to see a proper roll out and end date for implementing the new cables and no more excuses about how far away I am from an exchange.	Noted see MAR 21 New policy inserted

15	Mr and Mrs Dyer	<p>Penalties to BT or any broadband provider who lie about the package on offer.</p> <p>My speed is 1.2!!</p> <p>We have lived at Falcon Park for 20 years and have seen considerable changes and would like the following before more are implemented:</p> <p>Noise and light pollution at Betts Avenue "Light" industrial site. It has often been overlooked how interfering to our quality of life is disturbed when noisy (especially overnight) businesses operate just behind Falcon Park.</p> <p>Walking – we need pedestrian crossings to get anywhere! Double yellow lines and clearly defined cycle lanes,</p> <p>Defined areas where dogs can be off lead and when they need to be restrained would facilitate comfortable walking for those less agile and afraid or allergic to animals.</p> <p>Leisure – Very little for general pleasure in the area; Cinema/theatre; swimming pool and adventure area for teenagers would be beneficial for all.</p> <p>Security – 2000 homes will increase local populace by a large amount. This causes concern, our area has had very low crime and vandalism record, some worry about the impact it could have on our way of life in the future,</p>	<p>This is an enforcement matter rather than planning</p> <p>See MAR 14 and 15</p> <p>See 9.1 Non Policy Actions</p> <p>See MAR 9,10 and 11</p> <p>This is speculation and matters such as crime are not for an NP.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>		
16	Jo Garrod-Spall	<p>Underpass (Main Road) – I think this needs urgently addressing in the times we live in. We use this a lot to get to the Park and Ride and this time of the year for my teenage daughter returning from college after dark. The underpass is a daunting and nerve wracking prospect, I also myself would rather drive and park at the Park and Ride as I am nervous of going through there. Such a simple solution would be to completely cut down surrounding trees etc so the inside of the underpass could be clearly seen from the road in either direction. Maybe not so pleasing to the eye but a lot safer.</p> <p>Zebra Crossing – desperately needed to cross from Tesco side to retail area as so incredibly busy and dangerous crossing there now.</p>	<p>Highways – non NP</p>	<p>Identified as a weakness 2.16</p> <p>See MAR 15</p>	<p>No change</p>	
17	Mrs M Blom	<p>It is understood that we need more houses, especially small starter homes for new buyers and for elderly to downsize. But basically before anyone plans future houses, shops etc. We must a completely new thinking about our disastrous road system, it is nearly grid lock at times, complete lack of forward planning. The Square and the new retail outlets such as M&S with further shops planned are a nightmare even now, Please more common sense!</p>	<p>CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17 Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and 9.1 Non</p>	<p>No change</p>		

				Policy Actions	
18	Egan		I would like a properly lit walking pathway linking Black Tiles side of Main Road to the shops – Tesco etc. One bus an hour and in winter months I am afraid to walk across heath land to get to shops and bus, also the last bus finishes at 7pm approx.. It would help to be able to get a later bus which stops at Tesco and across the heath in safety. Apart from that I am content with the draft NP although I think my comments falls outside the NP Please ensure increased doctors and medical facilities are included in future plans. Also ensure existing doctors remains viable.	Noted	No change
19	Dennis & Double			Text amended	
20	Neal		Would like to see in our area some kind of social club for neighbours to be able to relax and enjoy one another's company.	Noted – see Community Buildings 6.1	No change
21	Jones		The summary document exclusion page near back did not make clear that the exclusions related to existing problems. Trees are being felled and not replaced, especially on industrial estate. In Germany cycle track are pink and footpaths grey can we have this too please?	Noted	Text amended
22	Wilkes		Extend the doctors surgery onto existing land owned by Graingers. There is a need on Martlesham Heath for homes for the elderly. This will free up larger family homes for younger persons to move into and raise their families. There is a problem with insufficient car parking spaces on the retail park. Any further development must be able to provide parking for customers and staff.	MAR 3 reviewed	Text amended
23	Hudson		Comments: Wish to retain character of housing in Martlesham Heath; Concerned about safety of pedestrians on shared cycle routes/foot paths; Keen to retain the current amount of green space; Concerned about future volume of traffic and access on to and across A12; Concerned about growing litter problem.	Identified as a weakness 2.14 see MAR 5 Identified as a weakness 2.16 See MAR 17 and 9.1 Non-policy actions	No change No change
24	Kingsbury		Thank you for the hard work put into this plan.	Noted	No change
25	Connors		Unfortunately all our very major concerns are outside the scope of the plan, Some we have already raised our concerns over:- The real dangers of being a pedestrian negotiation the retail park. Issues 1-5 opposite,	Noted See MAR 15	No change
			It is a shame so many new homes are planned as there is no way Martlesham will not change out of all proportion with at least a doubling of the population. It is also a shame that nationally not more emphasis can be put on brown fill sites usage,	Noted	No change
26	Robert & Rita Dunnott		Content with the draft NP but pollution on the A1214 worse than A12. Consideration for Northern Bypass must be part of the Agenda,	The Northern Bypass is a strategic matter beyond the control of any neighbourhood plan.	No change

27	Mrs Clement		It's important that people do have gardens, keep our open green spaces. Roads and parking areas very important,	Agreed – see MAR 7 and 8	No change
28	Brewster & Martin		Speeding on Eagle Way needs addressing before a fatal accident occurs.	Outside scope of NP Noted	No change No change
29	Cooper		Congratulations for all the hard work – a good presentation. It's a shame that certain issues (ie traffic) are outside the scope of the Plan. We must have a plan and this is very good.		
30	Mellen		We have no tennis courts at Martlesham and I have to go to Kesgrave to play, An area near the Control Tower could be used (where a hangar was demolished). There is car parking available here.	Noted – please see MAR 9 and 10	No change
31	Rittman		<p>There are increased problems in the Industrial Area caused by lorries using the area as a "free" lorry park – now affecting verges being used for vehicle parking, Can this be prevented?</p> <p>The area near the BT roundabout is becoming increasingly congested. I am concerned that the Aldi development near that corner will increase the problem. Have their plans allowed for sufficient parking for their store? The roads around Next etc are often full of parked cars (staff?) – before any customers have arrived.</p> <p>In principle the draft is good but the following amendments should be considered:</p> <p>The plan to state clearly that no additional buildings will be permitted in the "local gaps", so they are maintained,</p> <p>A statement how those responsible for Highways & Transport will be lobbied and supported to ensure traffic flows through Old Martlesham. Road infrastructure is improved and commuter traffic reduced,</p> <p>In all future developments, especially Adastral Park the principles learning from Para 2.6 be vigorously applied.</p>	<p>Existing problems out of scope of NP – should be dealt with by Highways and landowner.</p> <p>Policies for new development MAR15, 16 and 17 and Non Policy actions.</p> <p>The policy is considered to be as robust as it can be within the existing national policy framework</p>	<p>No change</p>
32	Michael Meras		A "Green Belt" South West of Woodbridge. Join up the two purple areas (1) North area – $\frac{1}{2}$ Sleckford Hall and its 32 acres bounded by roads (2) West of Top Street. Martlesham needs an area of Green Belt so people can see and know it's there otherwise greater Ipswich is our tomorrow and Woodbridge is no more a town in its own rights, Martlesham Creek and bird flight needs to be seen protected, by joining the two purple areas (MAR8) maybe to become (MAR2) status?	<p>It is not within the gift of the NP to designate green belt. The Plan has a local gap policy (MAR7) and this is the extent of the protection it can reasonably place on development.</p>	<p>No change</p>
33	Robert Jones		Although I am content for the Draft Plan to be progressed I still have some comments on the document.	<p>Traffic levels on the Old Felixstowe Toad, coupled with very poor road surface near Crown Point and at the junction with Anson Road, make this an extremely dangerous road to cycle along, especially in poor weather. The primary reason why traffic levels are high is due to the abysmal design of the roundabout near Police HQ, forcing traffic to find alternative routes, Consideration should be given to making (part of) the road one-way (for cars</p>	<p>No change</p>

		only) therefore allowing more space for cyclists. (And changing the design of the Police HQ roundabout – getting rid of the traffic lights would be a big improvement. I know this is out of your scope, but ...)		
		As mentioned in the document, I fully agree a safe cycle route to Woodbridge would be a huge improvement.	Noted Noted	
34	J Kelso – District Councillor Martlesham Ward	<p>Many trees (mostly Silver Birch) have been cut down on the Retail Park within the last year. I have seen no new trees being planted. The character of the area has been diminished by the loss of these trees. There should be some incentive/encouragement to replace trees with as least as many as have been removed. (Comment already submitted at the Beacon Hill session).</p> <p>Can't find any references to lighting (street or otherwise), but if applicable, it should be non-polluting as far as possible (i.e. light should be where required, not blotting out the night sky). And preferably turned off at quiet hours.</p> <p>Overall this is an excellent document, capturing many of the existing issues, and proposing sensible proposals for the future. My congratulations for all the hard work that has obviously gone into its production. Good luck in making it work!</p>	<p>This is not a planning matter, it is related to highways. However has been included as a non-policy action.</p>	
35	Christopher Rees - Savills	MAR3 MAR18	<p>Savills acts on behalf of Grainger plc, in providing planning consultancy and advice as to the future delivery of mixed-use development at Martlesham Village, which we are pleased to note has been identified via Policy MAR3.</p>	<p>MAR3 and MAR18 reviewed. MPC engaging with Graingers</p>

	<p>Grainger plc would welcome the opportunity to liaise with the NP Group and Parish Council regarding these proposals further, particularly to understand what non-residential land uses could be delivered within the realm of a commercially viable mixed-use scheme, to also include residential, open space/ landscaping and new consolidated car parking. With regard to new open space / landscaping, we do acknowledge and envisage opportunities to reflect this history of the area and specifically the locally listed remains of the former runway more fully than what currently exists and wherever possible.</p> <p>While the draft NP sets out its aspirations in respect of future housing mix and tenure, each future planning application will of course be subject to a viability test, to ensure that it is deliverable. This position is reflected within the Core Strategy, and will be reflected within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Within the NP, reference is made to viability within Policy MAR18, and the loss of employment use, but thereafter, it does not appear to be a consideration in respect of other land uses coming forward, and no reference is made within Policy MAR3. In this regard, we consider Policy MAR3 should be updated to conclude that the precise scale and form of the mixed-use development will be subject to it being shown to be viable.</p> <p>It is noted throughout the NP that a number of strengths and weaknesses have been highlighted, which the delivery of a mixed-use development via MAR3 could build upon and equally seek to address.</p> <p>That said, there will be underlying costs associated with delivery of social and physical infrastructure, in particular the new car parking, which will need to be financed via other elements of the development.</p> <p>To this end, an inclusive dialogue with the Parish and the community is required to establish priorities, and thereafter, the formation of a viable scheme which will deliver overall benefits for the community in respect of new housing, non-residential uses/open space and new car parking. Such a process will include at its heart a continual assessment of viability, and thus, it should be reflected within Policy MAR3 wording.</p> <p>Grainger plc and its advisors look forward to engaging with the Parish and the community in respect of the formation and delivery of the mixed-use development at the Village Centre.</p>	
36	David and Diane Carruthers	Dear Neighbourhood Plan Team

			MAR 2 and MAR 3 reviewed and revised	Text amended
	<p>Thank you for the householder consultation document and the opportunity to visit the public display on 15/12. I've been looking at the Plan with particular reference to Martlesham Heath and I am impressed by the framework and policies and the sheer amount of work that has been done.</p> <p>However, there are a few things that concern me, perhaps in some cases through either my lack of knowledge of the discussions which led to the policies or through not being up to date with wider planning guidance. I hope you don't mind me raising them with you below. I apologise in advance for the length of these comments, but I wanted to try and substantiate my concerns and make suggestions rather than just negative comments. I can send a hard copy in due course, if necessary.</p>	<p>1) Areas To Be Protected From Development MAR2</p> <p>I am concerned that there is a conflict between paragraph 4.13 of the Neighbourhood Plan which suggests that development "<i>will not normally be permitted</i>" in those areas and the more lenient wording of the policy itself which allows that development "<i>will normally be permitted</i>" subject to provisos.</p> <p>I think that the policy as proposed could easily send the wrong message to would be developers. It suggests that development will "normally be permitted" but does not indicate what categories of development might actually be suitable within the protected areas (or what might not) and, most critically, leaves the decision maker in the position of having to hang each planning decision on what may end up being mainly a visual judgement: as to whether the proposal would "materially detract from the character and appearance" (of those areas). I'm not convinced that the operation of the policy would produce predictable or clear cut decisions and, in practice, the benefit of the doubt would lie with the developer and onus would be on the planning authority to prove harm in any cases of refusal of planning permission.</p> <p>I know that land ownership and legal agreements may currently limit the vulnerability of some of the green sites to unplanned development, but the planning policy should still be capable of standing alone, so, for the sake of illustration, would it be acceptable under MAR2 for all the residents along the east side of Deben Avenue to all add 20 metres to their rear gardens? I can</p>		

	<p>see an argument that doing so would only represent a small loss to what is a large area at Portal woodlands and that the woodlands would retain their general character and appearance without material effect. Would it be acceptable to build a bungalow on the small part of North Green that has currently been fenced off? – again the same argument might apply. If such proposals were to be deemed acceptable by the planning authority or on appeal, what would happen if similar proposals arose elsewhere? Where would the line be drawn? The current wording of MAR2 seems to leave the policy very open to interpretation and the “green” areas at risk of attrition.</p> <p>I understand that negatively worded and generally restrictive policies tend to be discouraged under current national guidance but there is very strong local support for preserving the green areas, a lot of work is put into maintaining and enhancing them and they have been protected by Local Plan policy for many years. Are you 100% sure that a more overtly restrictive policy (similar to the old LP28) would not be appropriate or acceptable here?</p> <p>Alternatively, it might be possible to take a more positive approach – by having a positively worded policy which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Gives priority to protecting and enhancing the benefits to visual amenity, outdoor recreation, pedestrian/cycle connection between hamlets and habitat that they provide – and b) Allows such development as promotes that objective. <p>I looked at this:http://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/storage/resources/documents/Deconstructed_planning_policies.pdf and it seems that it might be possible.</p> <p>For the purpose of illustration I've had a go at rewording the Neighbourhood Plan paragraphs running up to MAR2 and the policy itself, but it's not fully thought out – just an idea for your discussions in case you might think it worth considering a different approach to that policy.</p> <p><i>4.12 A planned feature of almost equal importance to the built up areas is the arrangement of linked open spaces and landscaped areas which runs</i></p>
--	---

	<p><i>between them and expands in various locations in the form of two village greens (including spaces for cricket and other organised recreation), two large woodland belts and the Western Corridor which is designated as an SSSI and is a habitat for rare flora and fauna including the silver studded blue butterfly. Almost all of these areas have, at one time or another, been included within the various application sites covering different stages of development at Martlesham Heath and specifically set aside as public open space or landscaping as part of the development process.</i></p> <p>4.13 The open areas to the north side of the village include a football pitch, a play area, the control tower aviation museum and nearby historic remnants from the time of WW2 which can also be found spread amongst the Portal woodlands. There are a number of local voluntary groups involved in the ongoing maintenance and enhancement of these areas. They include Martlesham Heath Householders Ltd who are responsible for the upkeep of substantial areas of public open space and woodland, the Portal Woodlands Conservation Group which is improving the woodland and discovering and stabilising historic remnants, Martlesham Heath Aviation Society and the local Suffolk Wildlife Trust which arranges regular working parties to promote appropriate habitat within the SSSI.</p> <p>4.14 These open spaces are important individually and collectively for a variety of reasons, including visual amenity (applicable to both major and minor spaces) formal and informal outdoor recreation, non-vehicular linkage between hamlets, habitat and historic association. They are important in their entirety because of the linked and flowing arrangement that they create and the planned concept behind them. They are well used as public open space, and both their usage and their management by volunteer groups contributes significantly to a sense of local identity, well-being and social cohesion.</p> <p>4.15 There is strong and widespread local support for the continued enhancement and protection of the spaces and so Policy MAR 2 designates them as Areas to be Protected from Development and sets the continued protection and enhancement of their qualities and benefits as its principal objective.</p> <p>4.16 Consideration has been given to the types of development that might be appropriate within the designated areas. Whilst new development such as</p>

	<p>housebuilding or changes of use would run counter to the main policy objective, there are certain types of development that may be required in connection with the maintenance and enhancement of the areas themselves or their usage as public open space, and relevant provision is made for these within the policy. As the areas abut existing residential development the policy also allows some flexibility for small ancillary developments. The policy does not rule out non-specified developments, but any proposals would be expected to promote the principal policy objective of MAR 2.</p> <p>MAR2 revised</p> <p>Within the Areas to be Protected from Development marked in green on the proposals map, priority will be given to protecting and enhancing the benefits to visual amenity, outdoor recreation, linkage between hamlets, habitat and historic association that they provide.</p> <p>Any development within those areas must promote that objective and may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Buildings and enclosures required either in connection with the enhancement or the interpretation of the history of the area concerned, or in connection with outdoor recreational use nearby, provided they are sited, designed and of materials to minimise their impact on the character and qualities of the area. <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Development required for purposes ancillary to abutting residential development, in situations where the new development would maintain or improve the visual relationship between buildings and open space and have no detrimental impact on the character, extent or qualities of the area concerned. <p>One disadvantage of this type of revision is that it makes no provision for other (un-designated) gaps/gardens etc. However, policy MAR3 could be amended to require development to take account of the character of the hamlet in which the site is located, including features such as the gapping between buildings and established trees and planting.</p>	

		In my opinion, the benefits of providing more clear cut control over development in the designated green areas outweigh the disadvantages.
	<p><u>2) Police Headquarters/recreation field and PIC site</u></p> <p>This very large area (approximately the size of two residential hamlets) is within the proposed physical limits of Martlesham Heath but there are no Neighbourhood Plan policies guiding its re-use or redevelopment in the event of Suffolk Constabulary vacating it at some point over the next 15 years. There may be SCDC policies (perhaps safeguarding employment use) which affect it, but if the Neighbourhood Plan is approved as it is, the owners could reasonably expect to develop it but there would be no site specific local control over what that development might be. Given its size and significance I think there is perhaps a case for a guiding policy – and some questions come to mind:-</p> <p>Should any parts of the site be safeguarded in the event of development? (e.g. tree belt in front of PIC, part of the playing field)</p> <p>Would there be a preference for reuse of the buildings or redevelopment?</p> <p>Should any new employment use be restricted to a type that is a good neighbour to the nearest residential hamlet?</p> <p>Might it actually be better to have residential development there – given that most development on the west side of the A12 is residential and the Neighbourhood Plan has housing objectives that will be very difficult to meet anywhere else? There would be access implications – with probably some effect on the Portal woodlands.</p> <p>As you can see, I haven't given this a great deal of thought at this stage but it does seem a very large and important site to be given potential development status but left without a specific policy.</p>	<p><u>3) Martlesham Village Centre Development (Policy MR3)</u></p> <p>Parking</p>
		This is the last significant area for potential development within the planned

	<p>village and the Neighbourhood Plan probably represents the best and last opportunity to make specific provision for any particular type of development that is desirable in the public interest and to make sure that there is adequate car parking provision in the village centre for the long term.</p>	
	<p>There was an original Master Plan for the village, but I don't think it has always been followed and times (including factors such as car ownership and the size of vehicles) have changed substantially since it was drawn up some 36 years ago. Hopefully, the Neighbourhood Plan offers scope for a fresh look and clear guidance.</p>	
	<p>As things stand, the overall provision of car parking around the village centre seems just about able to cope with the parking demand generated by the existing development. Parking on Eagle Way is a known problem (associated mainly with the school run and special events) and there is now often day long parking in the entrance to Saddlers Place and near the blind corner a little way down that road. When I looked at the village centre car parks on 15/12/16 (at 10.30 am - well after the school/nursery run) there was 1 space left in the area to the west of the centre. There were approximately 10 spaces left in the car park to the east of the centre (some larger vehicles had to straddle the small bays) and approximately 16 in the North Green car park (mainly the northern extremity).</p>	<p>Against that background and the fact the Neighbourhood Plan statement on parking standards says (at paragraph 7.26) "<i>It is also considered that there should be no reduction of existing parking provision, either off-street or on-street, unless it can be appropriately re-provided</i>" I am concerned that Policy MAR3 makes no clear provision for the retention of existing parking in the village centre and is rather vague about the precise provision of further parking. Policy MAR3 refers to Policy MAR15 (this should actually be MAR16) which in turn refers to the Suffolk Advisory parking standards - which set parking requirements for retail and other uses based on the extent of floor space. However, MAR3 then goes on to say that development "<i>should preferably contain car parking for village centre users</i>" and that "<i>it should not result in additional car parking along Eagle Way, particularly close to the village.</i>" From my reading it really did not seem at all clear whether, under the Neighbourhood Plan, development in the village centre will actually require more or fewer spaces than would be expected under the Suffolk Advisory</p>

	<p>I feel that there is a strong case for a specific policy relating to parking provision in the village centre to say that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Planning permission will not be granted for developments which would replace the existing car parks (to be marked on plan) unless alternative provision is made for the car parking needs of the businesses, facilities and visitors which they serve. Such alternative provision must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Be made in the immediate vicinity. b) Offer the same or better levels of accessibility and number of parking spaces. 2) Any new development within the village centre shall be provided with additional parking spaces in accordance with the Suffolk Advisory standards. <p><u>Doctors' Surgery</u></p> <p>On page 15 of the Plan document the small GP surgery is listed as one of the weaknesses to be addressed, but there is no policy to promote any improvement. I believe that the Doctor's surgery provides an essential service for the village and that there would be strong support for facilitating either a new surgery or the extension of the existing one.</p> <p>The only potential location remaining within Martlesham Heath is the land identified in MAR3. With that in mind I wonder if it is feasible for a land use policy relating to the village centre to say something along the lines that:</p> <p>"In considering proposals for any new development within the village centre, priority will be given to the provision of new or extended facilities for the Doctor's Surgery currently located there."</p> <p>In practice, the best solution may be the extension of the existing premises and, if the Neighbourhood Plan could in some way safeguard the land needed to enable that to happen, that would be a major achievement.</p> <p>I do hope that you will be able to give some consideration to these issues. I</p>	

		would be very happy to discuss any of them with the NP team if that would help.		
37	Frank Bright	<p>The BT housing site with 2000 houses will generate 4000 cars, all wanting to leave for work, play school, primary school, secondary school, hospital and doctor's appointments, etc. between 07:30 and 08:30. Facilities, such as a primary school will not be available on the site until the development is complete, as numbers will be too small, and neither will be a bus service as demand, if any, depending on routes, will not become available until the end of such service cannot be justified economically. We have been through all of that before.</p> <p>The last developer tried to accommodate such a volume of additional traffic with traffic lights, but couldn't, just as a quart cannot be put into a pint bottle. The capacity of the A12 is already at saturation point.</p> <p>The present developer is trying to fudge the issue with co-ordinated traffic lights between the three roundabouts. That is known as a "green wave", is an old American traffic engineering idea and suitable for a large number of wide streets with many lanes at right angles to one another and many blocks which are an equal distance apart. The local conditions are nothing like that. At evening peak period the industrial area is already blocked by cars leaving BT and while a gap may be made for the occasional 66 bus that makes no dent into the queues of cars in that area wanting to get home and to concentrate on the A12, to the exclusion of the effect on the neighbourhood, will only make matters worse.</p>	<p>CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17</p> <p>Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and Section 9.1 Non Policy Actions</p>	No change
	MHH		<p>I just want to know what the attitude of the DOT is to the developer's ideas.</p> <p>Referring to your comments on 30mph road signs painted on the road surfacing: Section 82(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984) defines a restricted road (restricted to 30mph) as a road which has street lights placed at no more than 200 yds. (183m) apart. The Old Felixstowe Road has always struck me as rather dark. Any idea what the spacing of the few lamp posts really is?</p> <p>Thank you for your email regarding the draft Neighbourhood Plan. We at Martlesham Heath Householders recently discussed the document at our monthly meeting and wanted to state that we thought it was a thoroughly put together document that reflected the community.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>No change</p>

	Waldringfield Parish Council	Waldringfield Parish Council reviewed and discussed your Neighbourhood Plan at its meeting on Tuesday. It has no comment to make save to commend Martlesham Parish Council on the excellent production of the plan and to record that it looks forward to working together with MPC on matters of shared concern.	Noted No change
38	Stephen Stokes	<p>Considering the considerable limitations to the scope of the plan I think the councillor's and volunteers performed an outstanding job, well done.</p> <p>There are just two amendments we would like to see.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The areas not to be developed should also include Walk Farm and the fields aligning Three Stiles Lane 2. It's not clear if traffic calming is out of scope. If it is not then Main Road Martlesham needs a plan to ensure the 30 mph speed limit is enforced. 	<p>See Policy MAR 1 – Physical Limits Boundary. Out of scope for NP</p>
39	Mr & Mrs C Reed	<p>The Vision for Martlesham. Page 4 item 3</p> <p>It is inevitable that pressure to develop green space areas such as the Western Corridor, in and around Martlesham Heath and Kesgrave, will be felt over time, however it is essential that these areas are preserved for the benefit of our community. These areas are important recreation facilities, they maintain the varied history, original fauna and flora of the area and help to establish the individual identities of Martlesham Heath and Kesgrave. They must not be lost to developers.</p> <p>Parking Standards. Page 7</p>	<p>Agreed see MAR 7 and 8 No change</p> <p>Agreed but NP can only influence new developments – see MAR 16 No change</p>

		<p>Getting Around. Page 10</p> <p>In any development plan, as you have shown, weaknesses have to be identified and addressed. The development of a possible 2000 homes will cause significant problems of vehicle flow, volume and access problems for current residents and if not addressed appropriately for future ones too. The potential number of vehicles likely to be used in the area will cause parts of the traffic flow and road systems such Martlesham Heath / BT / Tesco / Foxhall Road roundabouts to fail. Therefore Capital Project Roadworks such as Flyovers or Underpasses at key intersections will have to be carried out before the first new house foundation stone is laid; the existing road infrastructure cannot cope with the large number of construction vehicles that will be needed during the long build period.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17 Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and 9.1 Non Policy Actions</p>
40	Barbara Adamski SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL	<p>Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council (SCC) on the pre-submission version of your neighbourhood plan. The county council is not a plan making authority, except for minerals and waste. However, it is a fundamental part of the planning system being responsible for matters including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Archaeology -Education -Fire and Rescue -Flooding -Health and Wellbeing -Libraries -Minerals and Waste -Natural Environment -Rights of Way -Transport 	86

This response, as with all those comments which the county council makes on emerging planning policies and allocations, will focus on matters relating to those services (and others).	<p>Suffolk County Council is supportive of the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan vision for the plan area. The plan is written positively and the document well structured. Whilst a number of concerns with the plan itself are outlined below, the county council is willing to assist Martlesham Parish Council in further developing its plan where matters relate to county council service responsibilities and policy objectives.</p> <p>The advice is given in this responds to the Neighbourhood Plan is without prejudice to any advice provided following any formal planning application consultation on sites identified in this plan.</p> <p>General</p> <p>In chapter 3 'Vision' the Neighbourhood Plan refers to the strategic development at Adastral Park located to the south of the Martlesham parish. The qualifying body made the decision not to include the allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan area due to different reasons which are discussed and listed in the Neighbourhood Plan Area Determination and Decision document which is published here. The parish council acknowledged that the development of Adastral Park will have a significant effect on the community and therefore cannot be ignored by the Neighbourhood Plan. Regarding the strategic development para. 3.5 of chapter 3 identifies potential implication for the Neighbourhood Plan area. The list is comprehensive and furthermore each chapter considers related issues separately. In addition to the proposed growth at Adastral Park and the current development of 180 homes known as Mill Heath, the Neighbourhood Plan makes provision for future infill development within the plan area.</p> <p>Taking all the future growth in consideration SCC would welcome a reference to education provision, including Early Years and Childcare services. From September 2017 when some 3 and 4 year olds will be eligible for 30 hours of free childcare per week, it is predicated that it will cause a considerable increase in the demand for pre-school places within the Martlesham parish. Therefore, any additional housing would create a demand for additional</p>	<p>Agreed. This can be included in the local context section.</p> <p>Text added</p>

		<p>The county council has a legal duty to ensure provision of education from ages 2 to 16. The National Planning Policy Framework (paras. 38, 72, 203-204) establishes a role for the planning system in ensuring that provision can be met, in resolving issues before planning applications come forward. Furthermore, it seeks to minimise the need for travel, especially by private car. Safe routes to school are necessary; otherwise the education authority must bear the cost of school transport.</p> <p>The County and District Councils would use their shared approach for ensuring that development makes provision for early years, primary, secondary and sixth form education, which is set out in the adopted 'Section 106 Developer's Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk'.</p> <p>It is expected that development funds new places, if needed, through Section 106 agreements or the community infrastructure levy.</p> <p>When a site allocation or planning application comes forward for consultation, the county council considers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Whether local schools can cope with the additional pupils arising from the development. If there is sufficient spare capacity, no action needs to be taken. -If local schools do not have sufficient spare capacity, whether it is possible for those schools to be expanded by means of developer contributions (of land and funding for construction). -If it is not possible for development to enable necessary education expansion, the may recommend that development does not take place. <p>Even though the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate land for development, given the intended scale of development at Adastral Park and its proximity to Martlesham village providing services would seek to find a cohesive solution for both sites.</p> <p>See: http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/business/planning-and-design-advice/planning-obligations/</p>
--	--	---

	<p>National policy in relation to archaeology is set out in chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. By meeting these requirements, and ensuring proper assessment, excavation and recording of archaeology prior to development, the planning system can contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>In chapter 2 the plan refers to the historic development of Martlesham. SCC would like to suggest that the review of the history of the parish could also include references to earlier activity as stated under para. 2.1. We would like to recommend adding something along the lines of:</p> <p>Prehistoric communities exploited the heathland resources within the Neighbourhood Plan area and there are significant groups of prehistoric funerary monuments within it. The heathland landscape continued to be used by communities over the following centuries.</p> <p>The vision of the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan refers to the natural environment and the open spaces. We would like to propose to amend Vision number 3 to 'Respect and protect the natural and historic environment...' The specific consideration of Heritage Assets in chapter 6 is welcomed. However, there is confusion in Chapter 6 between Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets as Appendix 1 refers to bowl barrows which are Scheduled Monuments and therefore designated, as well as discussing approaches to both listed and non-listed buildings.</p> <p>For clarity and simplicity, SCC would recommend amending the section heading and well as the heading of Policy MAR13 to 'Designated and Non-designated heritage assets'.</p> <p>In addition, it is proposed to change the last sentence of para. 6.27 to 'A number of these barrows are statutorily protected as Scheduled Monuments – these are listed in Appendix 1'.</p> <p>Accordingly, Appendix 1 needs renaming as it comprises non-designated buildings, but includes designated archaeological assets as well. It is proposed to rename the appendix to 'Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets'.</p>	<p>Agreed. Added to history Text added</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Amendment made</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Amendment made</p>

41	John Fleming Gladman Developments Ltd	Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 consultation 1.1.1 Context	The Neighbourhood Plan is seeking to be positive about growth within the context of a sensitive environment and built heritage context. Whilst we No change

		<p>1.1.1 These representations provide the response of Gladman Developments (hereafter referred to as "Gladmans") to the current consultation held by Martlesham Parish Council (MPC) on the pre-submission version of the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>1.1.2 Through these representations, Gladman seeks to clarify the relationship of the MNP to both national and local policy requirements. This submission provides an analysis of the neighbourhood plan as currently proposed, highlighting areas in which we feel the document currently lacks clarity and would benefit from amendments to several policies to ensure the Plan accords with the provisions required by national planning policy and guidance.</p> <p>1.1.3 Upon reviewing the pre-submission version of the MNP, it is considered that the Plan should reconsider its position and its potential to deliver additional housing growth to meet district housing needs. The use of a number of restrictive policy tools is particularly concerning and may jeopardise the Plan's ability to meet basic conditions.</p> <p>1.1.4 The Parish Council will be aware of Gladman's land interest in Woodbridge at land off Duke's Park. Gladman submit that this site would assist in housing delivery in Woodbridge, a second tier settlement which is a focal point for future growth. This site has a functional relationship with Woodbridge and is adjacent to the existing built form of that settlement. To ensure that the MNP meets the basic conditions, it should not seek to unduly restrict growth on the edge of Woodbridge, which in its current form seems to be the case.</p> <p>1.1.5 Gladman would like to assist the Parish Council in helping to refine the contents of the draft neighbourhood plan to ensure that it is found in conformity with the basic conditions and invite the Parish Council to contact us in this regard.</p>	<p>note that the Local Plan requires a review in the short term, it is appropriate that matters relating to this and specifically addressing objectively assessed housing needs are dealt with by SCDC through its Local Plan review.</p>
		<p>2. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS, NATIONAL POLICY AND JUDGMENTS</p> <p>2.1 Legal Requirements</p> <p>2.1.1 Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum, it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The Basic</p>	91

	<p>conditions that the MNP must meet are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order; b) Having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, it is appropriate to make the order; c) Having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area, it is appropriate to make the order; d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development; e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area); and f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.
	<p>2.2 National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>2.2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so, it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role in which they play in delivering sustainable development to meet identified development needs.</p> <p>2.2.2 At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs (OAN) for housing, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is also applicable to neighbourhood plans.</p>

	<p>2.2.3 The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 16 of the Framework makes clear that qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development that plan positively to support local development.</p> <p>2.2.4 Paragraph 17 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a clear and positive vision for the future of the area and policies contained in those plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.</p>
	<p>2.2.5 Paragraph 184 of the Framework makes clear that the ambition of the neighbourhood plan should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area. To facilitate this, local planning authorities (LPAs) will need to set out clearly their strategic policies to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Where a neighbourhood plan proceeds in advance of the adoption of a Framework-compliant Local Plan, this will create uncertainty as to whether the neighbourhood plan provides an appropriate basis for the spatial approach contained in its administrative area.</p> <p>2.3 Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>2.3.1 It is clear from the requirements of the Framework that neighbourhood plans should be prepared in conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider area as confirmed in an adopted development plan. The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>2.3.2 On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan. In particular, the changes to the PPG stress the importance of considering housing reserve sites, and providing indicative delivery timetables to ensure that emerging evidence of housing needs is addressed to help minimise any potential conflicts that can arise and are not overridden by a new Local Plan. In this</p>

	<p>2.3.3 On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG. These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take to review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention which includes a detailed explanation outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard.</p> <p>2.3.4 Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded. Accordingly, the MNP will need to be updated so that it takes into account the latest guidance issued by the Secretary of State so that it can be found in compliance with basic conditions (a) and (e)</p>	
	<h3>3. DEVELOPMENT PLAN</h3> <h4>3.1 Adopted Development Plan</h4> <p>3.1.1 To meet the requirements of the Framework and the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, neighbourhood plans should be prepared to conform to the strategic policy requirements set out in an adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>3.1.2 The current Development Plan relevant to the preparation of the MNP consists of the adopted Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (adopted July 2013). Whilst the Development Plan was prepared after the publication of the Framework, the Examining Inspector expressed significant concerns regarding the Plan's ability to meet fully Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for housing to address this issue, the Council made a commitment to undertake an early review to address the level of housing provision by 2015. This review has yet to be undertaken. Accordingly, in the absence of a Framework and PPG compliant Local Plan based on full OAN for the housing market area the requirements of the Framework take precedence.</p> <h4>3.2 Emerging Local Plan Review</h4> <p>3.2.1 Following the adoption of the Site Allocations Plan, the Council will commence work on its Local Plan Review in order to be found consistent with the requirements of the Framework. The emerging Local Plan Review will set</p>	94

	<p>out the overarching planning strategy for the district and will identify Suffolk Coastal's full OAN for housing.</p> <p>3.2.2 As highlighted above, the Council has yet to undertake a review of the Local Plan. As such, there is considerable work to be undertaken to inform the preparation of the emerging Local Plan and what Martlesham and Woodbridge will need to accommodate to assist the Council in meeting the district's full OAN. Given that the Council has yet to commence work on the emerging Local Plan it is therefore clear that the Council are still a long way off having a Framework and PPG compliant Local Plan which is capable of being found sound at examination.</p>
	<p>3.2.3 The MNP seeks to make policy judgments on strategic matters that have yet to be determined and will act to not only contain the physical growth of Martlesham but will also have significant implications for future sustainable growth opportunities in Woodbridge. Such an approach does not have regard to the advice and guidance issued by the Secretary of State and is therefore contrary to basic conditions (a) and (d). The advice and guidance contained in the PPG specifically states that where a neighbourhood plan contains policies relevant to housing supply, these policies should take account of the latest and up-to-date evidence of housing needs (<i>PPG Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 41-040-20160211</i>). This evidence is not available and the Parish Council will need to ensure that the Plan allows for sufficient flexibility to ensure housing needs are delivered in full.</p> <p>4. Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>4.1 Context</p> <p>4.1.1 These representations are made in response to the current consultation on the submission version of the MNP under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This section highlights the key points that Gladman would like to raise with regard to the content of the neighbourhood plan as currently proposed.</p> <p>4.2 Neighbourhood Plan Policies</p> <p>Policy MAR1: Martlesham Physical Limits Boundaries</p> <p>4.2.1 This policy seeks to focus growth in Martlesham Heath and Martlesham Village within the physical limits boundary. Development proposals beyond this boundary will not be permitted unless they are in accordance with the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan policies in respect of development in the</p>

		<p>countryside or where they relate to necessary utilities infrastructure where no reasonable alternative is available.</p> <p>4.2.2 Gladman would be opposed to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude the delivery of otherwise sustainable growth opportunities from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Framework does not prevent the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities being delivered adjacent to existing settlements so long as the adverse impacts of a development proposal do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development.</p> <p>4.2.3 Through Policy MAR1, the MNP seeks to prevent growth not only to the adjacent built up area of Martlesham but would act to suppress growth in sustainable settlements such as Woodbridge. Development on the edge of Woodbridge would be to meet the needs associated with that settlement, despite the fact that these could potentially be located within the neighbourhood area. The PPG makes clear that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence . (<i>PPG Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20160519</i>)</p> <p>4.2.4 Gladman therefore recommend that Policy MAR1 is deleted in its current form. Instead, the Plan should seek to promote a strategy which ensures development proposals are considered on a case by case basis consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The following wording is submitted for the Parish Council's consideration:</p> <p>"When considering development proposals, the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan will take a positive approach to: new development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development 7 contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Applications that accord with the policies of the Local Plan and the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan will be supported particularly where they provide: -</p> <p>New homes including market and affordable housing; or –</p> <p>Opportunities for new business facilities through new or expanded premises; or –</p> <p>Infrastructure to ensure the continued vitality and viability of the settlement</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Development proposals adjacent to existing settlements will be permitted provided that any adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development”</p> <p>Policy MAR2: Areas to be protected from development</p> <p>4.2.5 Policy MAR2 states that development will normally be permitted where it would not materially detract from the character and appearance of 1) those areas in Martlesham Heath identified on the proposals map to be protected from development or further development; and 2) other sites, gaps, gardens and spaces which make an important contribution in their undeveloped form to a settlement within the physical limits boundaries identified on the proposals map, its setting, character, or the surrounding landscape or townscape.</p> <p>4.2.6 Paragraph 113 of the Framework makes clear that criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas should be used. Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks.</p> <p>4.2.7 As currently drafted, Gladman do not believe this landscape policy aligns with the requirements set out in the Framework as no evidence has been prepared to demonstrate why these areas are worthy of protection. Gladman believe that this policy needs to be revisited to ensure that it is consistent with the approach set out within the Framework.</p> <p>Policy MAR5: Residential mix</p> <p>4.2.8 In principle, Gladman support the general thrust of this policy. However, housing mix will inevitably change over a period of time and therefore this policy needs to secure a greater degree of flexibility going forward so that it can react to changing market conditions. This policy should therefore include reference to the latest housing needs assessment in the policy wording.</p> <p>4.2.9 Notwithstanding the above, Gladman question why the emphasis of this policy is to provide 2-3 bedroom dwellings. Gladman note the supporting text at S5.11 which states that ‘Given that most developments will be delivered as small windfalls and therefore will not individually provide a significant number of dwellings, it is considered appropriate and necessary to require a significant majority of the two and three bed properties to be provided as sheltered</p>
--	--

	<p>Policy MAR7: Local Gaps</p> <p>4.2.10 This policy seeks to implement a series of Local Gaps. Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances, we would question the purpose of the proposed gap designations, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the District's housing needs.</p> <p>4.2.11 The identification of a Local Gap is considered to be a strategic policy that should only be confirmed in an adopted Local Plan. Whilst it is noted that Saved Policy AP212 seeks to maintain the open character of land which separates villages of the Ipswich Eastern Fringe, this policy was progressed in an entirely different era of national policy which sought to focus growth to urban areas.</p> <p>4.2.12 The recent case of Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd & Richborough Estates Partnership LLP v Cheshire East Borough Council dated 17th March 2016 is informative on this point and the wide interpretation that such designations are relevant to the supply of housing. If this policy is not removed, and in the event the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, this policy will also be considered out of date.</p> <p>4.2.13 Gladman note paragraph 5.2 of the MNP which states "In addition these is expected to be a significant level of residential development within and immediately adjacent to the Neighbourhood Plan area. This includes the development of Woodbridge, being one of the market towns within Suffolk Coastal district where growth is expected to be focused".</p> <p>4.2.14 The above is a clear acknowledgement that land adjacent to Woodbridge located within the neighbourhood area is expected grow. This policy will therefore act to prevent the sustainable growth of Woodbridge</p>	

	<p>4.2.15 Notwithstanding the above, it is currently unknown whether Policy AP212 will be retained and progressed through the emerging Local Plan. As the policy already applies to the neighbourhood area there is no merit in simply repeating this policy. This has previously been addressed in the Examiner's Report to the Aireways Neighbourhood Plan where the Examiner recommended several policies be deleted as they were effectively repeating policy that already existed elsewhere in the development plan.</p> <p>Policy MAR8: Special Landscape Areas</p> <p>4.2.16 This policy seeks to ensure that no development will take place which would intrude upon or be to the detriment of, or detract from, the special landscape value of the valleys and tributaries of the River Deben.</p> <p>4.2.17 In addition to the comments already raised in response to Policy MAR2, as currently drafted, Gladman do not believe that this policy aligns sufficiently with the requirements of the Framework and PPG, given that this policy merely seeks to repeat the requirements contained in the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Saved Policy AP13. Gladman reiterate that there is no value in simply repeating policy that is already part of the adopted Development Plan. Gladman therefore recommend that Policy MAR8 is deleted.</p> <p>Policy MAR13: Non-designated heritage assets</p> <p>4.2.18 Although Gladman support the conservation of designated heritage assets, this policy states that planning permission will not be granted for development that would result in the loss of either listed buildings, or the non-designated heritage assets identified in appendix 1 of the Plan. This does not accord with the requirements of the Framework as the policy seeks to apply equal weight to both designated and non-designated heritage assets. This policy should seek to align with the requirements of the Framework, in that there are two separate balancing exercises which need to be undertaken for designated and non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>4.2.19 In addition, it would be useful if both designated and non-designated heritage assets were identified on the policies map.</p>	<p>5. STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</p>

	<p>5.1 Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>5.1.1 The preparation of Neighbourhood Plans falls under the scope of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SEA Regulations), that require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be undertaken where a Plan's proposals would likely result in significant adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>5.1.2 Both the SEA Directive and the Neighbourhood Planning PPG make clear that an SEA Screening Assessment should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity. It is currently unclear from the consultation documents whether an SEA is required or whether a Screening Assessment has been undertaken.</p> <p>5.1.3 Gladman recommend that the Parish Council investigate this matter. Should the results of the Screening Assessment identify that SEA is required then the Parish Council should ensure that the results of the SEA/SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the development needs for the area it should be clear from the results of this assessment why some policy options have progressed and others have been rejected.</p> <p>5.1.4 The SEA/SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of a Plan's preparation. It should assess the effects of a Neighbourhood plan's proposals and whether they would be likely to have significant environmental effects and whether the Plan is capable of achieving the delivery of sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>5.1.5 The SEA/SA should be able to clearly justify its policy choices and it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policies have been progressed, and others have been rejected. This must be undertaken through a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and rejected alternatives. The Parish Council's decision making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.</p> <p>5.1.6 The issue of adequate SEA testing is considered to be most pertinent following the recent decision made by Aylesbury Vale District Council to no longer contest a legal challenge made by Lightwood Strategic in response to the housing policies contained in the Haddenham Neighbourhood Plan due to inaccurate scoring being applied to individual housing sites. This subsequently led to the quashing of the housing and development chapter contained in the Haddenham Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	

	<p>6. SITE SUBMISSION</p> <p>6.1 Land off Dukes Park, Woodbridge</p> <p>6.1.1. A location plan has been included as Appendix 1 to this submission. As can be seen from appendix 1, this site falls within the MNP and therefore would be subject to the policies contained in the MNP. Gladman maintain that this site is in Woodbridge not Martlesham despite lying within the Neighbourhood PLAN AREA, THEREFORE DEVELOPMENT AT THIS SITE OFF Duke's Park would be delivering housing to meet the needs of Woodbridge, a tier 2 settlement identified for future growth.</p> <p>6.1.2 Gladman consider that the site is suitable, achievable and sustainable and is capable of accommodating sustainable growth to meet housing needs. An outline planning application (application reference: DC/15/4788/OUT) was validated on 1st December 2015 for up to 215 dwellings with public open space and landscape with all matters reserved, except for access and a retail convenience store (Use Class A1, up to 400sqm) with associated car parking, demolitions of existing structures and the introduction of new structural planting and landscaping measures including informal public open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation. On 4th March 2016, Suffolk Coastal District Council as Local Planning Authority refused to grant planning permission for the proposed development.</p> <p>6.1.3 A second planning application (application reference: DC16/3597/OUT) has been submitted to the Council for a reduced scheme of up to 140 dwellings in response to the Council's reasons for refusal to the first application. This application was also refused on 20th December 2016, and is now the subject on an on-going Appeal.</p> <p>6.1.3.1 The development proposal is located in an area identified as one of the main settlements expected to allow for growth to meet identified housing needs. Despite the Council's reasons for refusal, the proposals offer the opportunity to deliver sustainable growth to meet the housing needs for market and affordable housing. Further, the delivery of this scheme will help assist delivering the wider aspirations of the MNP and Woodbridge, and will bring real benefits to the local community, including: -</p> <p>The delivery of market and affordable housing in a sustainable location to meet identified housing needs. This will enable members of the local community to access the housing market locally rather than being forced to move away due to a lack of available housing. -</p>	

		<p>The provision of new public open space that is not currently available to residents along with more informal recreational space and landscaping to meet the needs of existing and future residents. –</p> <p>The creation of a high quality residential development which provides enhanced permeability within the local area, through the creation of footpath and cycle links whilst respecting the character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>- The delivery of this scheme will result in significant benefits for the local community and the surrounding area including the provision of New Homes Bonus payments, increasing the economic activity of the area through the construction phase and increased patronage to local services and facilities. This will help ensure that the operational capacity of the services and facilities, and their contribution to the overall viability and vitality of the local area.</p> <p>6.1.4 The above outlines only some of the key benefits that development in this location will provide and</p>
		<p>7. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>7.1 Assessment against the basic conditions</p> <p>7.1.1 Gladman recognise the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national policy and the up-to-date strategic requirements for the wider local authority area.</p> <p>7.1.2 Through this consultation response, Gladman have sought to clarify the relationship of the MNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider development needs and strategic policies set out in adopted and emerging Local Plans. As the MNP is being brought forward before an up-to-date Framework and PPG compliant Local Plan is in place for the wider authority area, the Parish Council should ensure that it allows for sufficient flexibility to ensure that the Plan is capable of reacting positively to changing conditions.</p> <p>7.1.3 Whilst the MNP's policies and proposals must be in conformity with the adopted Development Plan policies, consideration should also be given as to whether there are any alternative or additional housing sites that can come forward in the neighbourhood area to assist the Council in delivering its full OAN for housing. As highlighted throughout this response, the Plan as currently proposed runs the real risk of being found inconsistent with the basic conditions if it is progressed to examination in its current form. Not only does the Plan make no effort to identify additional opportunities to assist the Council</p>

42	Keith Palmer	<p>I have no objection to the draft being submitted as is but offer the following comments in case you feel the need to add or amend any part/s.</p> <p>1. My congratulations to all those who have clearly worked very long and hard on this most comprehensive document.</p> <p>2. You use the terms 'Old Martlesham' and 'Martlesham Village' throughout this document. Is there a difference as to the area described? If not can we establish a preferred description because just as Martlesham Heath is distinguished from Martlesham (meaning the whole parish) so the 'old part of Martlesham needs to distinguish itself from the rest of Martlesham. Can you help?</p> <p>3. I strongly support all the comments about the roads and parking in the Business Park and Retail Park. Conditions deteriorate year on year especially as spare spaces are developed. In particular the roundabout outside the Tesco entrance is regularly overwhelmed with traffic and can cause tailbacks onto the A12 and the awkward 4 way junction between Felixstowe Road, Anson Road and Glosster Road needs to be converted to a roundabout.</p> <p>4. MAR 7 also needs to consider the new 2000 homes development on the BT site (although mention may have been omitted because of the decision that the MNP should exclude that site which adjoins Adastral Park).</p>	<p>in meeting its housing needs, it seeks to prevent any further expansion of Woodbridge within the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>7.1.4 The Parish Council should take this opportunity to consider this response in full and make the necessary amendments to ensure the Plan is compliant with the basic conditions. The Parish Council will need to ensure that its proposals are compliant with the provisions set out in national policy and are based on robust and up-to-date evidence and have been properly tested through an adequate SEA (if required).</p> <p>7.1.5 Gladman take this opportunity to reiterate our offer to assist the Parish Council in preparing the draft neighbourhood plan and invite the Parish Council to contact us in this regard.</p> <p>Noted. Martlesham Village is the term used in the Local Plan, so the same term should be used when referring to Old Martlesham.</p> <p>CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17 Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and 9.1 Non Policy Actions</p> <p>Outside scope of NP</p>

		<p>5. Para 6.6 and MAR 8. Thank you for making special reference to the Fynn Valley as well as the Deben Valley. I fear that there may be a tendency by the planners to allow piecemeal development along Bealings Road even though on both sides of the road is a Special Landscape Area. The former gets rather less mention than the latter just due to size.</p> <p>6.Para 7.2 & Fig.7.1 When I attended the early consultation of the new proposed developers for the BT site and 2000 homes I was told that they are considering a direct road from the site onto the A12, effectively through the banked up screen alongside the A12. Should this appear on Fig 7.1 coloured green?</p> <p>7. Paras 7.7 & 7.16 Over time the A12 is going to become even more busy. Therefore your comments about improved and more access routes for non vehicle travellers is absolutely vital otherwise the road simply divides the Martlesham community in two</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Planning Application stage.</p> <p>See CEG submission Key Local Connection Strategy 10391-HL-101 and 102</p>	
43	Lawrence Burrows	<p>Many thanks for all of the work that you have put into this plan, attached is my feedback.</p> <p>Comments :-</p> <p>Generally happy with the draft Plan I am concerned that the Proposals map (page 86) of the plan and page 6 of the overview consultation document) is out of date in that:-</p> <p>Mill Heath is now nearing completion and planning permission was granted some time ago.</p> <p>Site for 47 houses in Black Tiles Lane has recently got planning permission but had been suggested for residential development by SCDC some time ago.</p> <p>Both of the above should have been included on the map in some way as they are outside the physical limits that are shown on the plan.</p> <p>There are also some issues that are included as policies and are also listed as being outside the scope of the plan (eg.pedestrian and cycle routes, travel within the retail park.); this needs to be clarified as it can be confusing if someone is not au fait with planning and the NP.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Amendments made</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Map amended</p> <p>Text amended</p>	

44	Clive Roper	<p>Basically I am in agreement with the Plan but believe that you should elaborate certain sections:</p> <p>Community Facilities - we should detail the village aspirations: Indoor Multi-Purpose Sports hall, Floodlit all weather multi Tennis Courts and a five/six-a-side football pitch.</p> <p>Getting around -item 5: we should stress that with the known difficulties of trying to get off Martlesham Heath onto the A12, there is the future Ipswich Northern By-Pass, which appears to be gaining more support particularly in the local press. Kesgrave is sometimes mention but seldom Martlesham. Whichever route is adopted and it is outside the remit of Martlesham Parish Council would lead to substantial addition traffic on the A12 through the village and our concerns should be raised now rather than wait until it is built.</p> <p>Doctors Surgery is often mentioned and I believe already funds should have come from the John Bloor development, we now have few doctors having gone from three full time to full two time and one part time, even though the population has gone up. When a Doctor is on leave and replacement doctors are not available, you have to wait weeks for an appointment.</p> <p>Funds need to be secured to improve the street lighting particularly on the Felixstowe and Glosster Roads where we should have LED lighting of a similar type to the Industrial site. Both these roads see considerable traffic flows to the stores and BT workers, which the industrial site does not. One light (208) directly opposite the emergency entrance to the new houses was out 13 months and I put it on the Suffolk County Council web site numerous times and sent several emails to SCC before this was repaired.</p> <p>Footpaths are in an appalling condition with no edging having taken place in years and the number of tree roots causing damage on Eagle Way, Broomfield and numerous other locations result in trip hazards and my wife has already fallen. The next time that it happens we will be claiming damages from SCC or SCDC.</p> <p>The promised improvements to the paths between Westland and Harvesters, and between The Oaks and Heathfields have never happen even though these were to take place once MHHL secured the lease, which happened sometime ago.</p>	<p>Noted – please see MAR 9, 10, 11 and non policy actions</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Out of scope for NP</p> <p>No change</p> <p>MAR 3 supports expansion of primary healthcare within the village centre.</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Out of scope of NP</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Out of scope of NP - Highways</p> <p>No change</p>
----	-------------	--	--

45	Andy Ryley Senior Associate Director of Planning - Max Industrial	<p>Please find attached our feedback form and schedule of comments on the 'Martlesham Parish Council MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Pre-Submission Consultation Version November 2016' on behalf of our client, Max Industrial GP Ltd and Max Industrial Nominees Ltd (who hold in trust for Max Industrial 2 LP), the owners/ managers of the Martlesham Heath Business Park.</p> <p>Para 1.6 Page 2 "Against this backdrop it was felt that a Neighbourhood Plan could help shape the new developments and integrate them with the existing settlements, and at the same time help to preserve the separate characteristics and amenities that already exist. The vision statement reflects this."</p> <p>AGREE – however, the management of the MHBPP would wish to be closely involved in the process as they are a key part of the neighbourhood and insofar as the Plan relates to the MHBPP.</p> <p>Paras 1.8-1.14 Pages 2 and 3 References to the Neighbourhood Plan area and Adastral Park inclusion</p> <p>MHBPP supports view of the MNPG that Adastral Park should be included within the area in order to allow greater cohesion between Adastral Park, the MHBPP and the wider neighbourhood plan area, and better integration of policies.</p>	<p>Adastral Park was excluded from the designated Neighbourhood Plan area for Martlesham, therefore the policies in the plan cannot directly apply to it. However, the importance of working together is noted.</p> <p>Para 2.4 Pages 7 and 8 References to the history of Adastral Park and the village of Martlesham Heath but not to the history of MHBPP</p> <p>History and aspirations of MHBPP should be included as follows: 'MHBPP began developing as an industrial estate in the years following the closure of the airfield in 1963? The business park now comprises some 4.6ha of employment land and is currently asset managed by Logicor Europe Ltd on behalf of the landlord Max Industrial GP Ltd and Max Industrial Nominees Ltd (who hold in trust for Max Industrial 2 LP). Logicor has sought to enhance its asset despite the extremely difficult economic climate. The amount of let employment floor space has increased from 2009-present day by some 29,000sqm with over £1.5m capital invested. The current owner has aspirations for MHBPP which include the development of small business start-ups, and continuing to accommodate these businesses once they succeed and grow, and to strengthen the appeal of the site by providing support services to help</p>

	Para 2.28 Page 16 No mention is made of the recent appeal decision regarding the hotel, pub/ restaurant and drive thru. Insert after last bullet point: 'MHBPs has a consent for the building of the hotel, pub/restaurant and drive thru recently won on appeal at the gateway sites to MHBPs which would provide additional facilities.'	Noted	Text updated
	Para 3.1 Page 18 Vision statement MHBPs support the positive vision set out Table under para 3.2 page 18 There is a need to also support the retention of existing business which should be reflected within point 2 of this table Insert in point 2: '.....to encourage the retention, creation and success....'	Noted	Text added
	Para 3.6 Page 20 Under traffic bullet point, 2nd bullet point refers to 'road inadequacies'. Unclear as to what this means. Clarity should be provided as to what 'road inadequacies mean, or are.	Noted	Text added
	Table 3.1 Page 22 Under point 2, 3rd column 'industrial areas' the 'Y' is missing. Insert 'Y' under point 2, 3rd column.	Noted	Text added
	Policy Mar1 Page 24 Martlesham Physical Limits Boundaries Support with the exception of Adastral Park which should be included.	This is outside the designated neighbourhood plan area so cannot be included.	No change
	Policy Mar2 Page 29 Areas to be Protected from Development Support		
	Policy Mar3 Page 29 Development within Martlesham Heath Support		
	Policy Mar4 Page 31 Residential Design and Amenity Support insofar as more residential will positively affect the need and provision of jobs and requirements for more commercial uses within MHBPs.		This is not an issue that was raised by the community and this is not considered to be a suitable location.
	Para 5.8-5.11 Pages 36-38 Housing Needs Consideration should be given to the identification of suitable sites for care homes and extra care villages with the substantial rise in the ageing population and need to release family home nos. The employment levels attributed to this care use, together with the proximity to local services provision, would mean the MHBPs would be a suitable location for such a use, albeit not a 'B' use class.		No change

	<p>Support but should be more specific in its approach to care for the elderly. Insert after last bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Care Home • Extra Care Accommodation <p>Also, consider additional para to read: 'Consideration will also be given to the provision of extra care accommodation on land currently zoned for 'B' use where suitably located.'</p>	<p>Policies Mar9/10 Page 45 Existing Community and Leisure Uses/ Provision of Additional Leisure Uses.</p> <p>The migration out of Martlesham Heath for indoor sports and leisure referred to in para 6.10 could potentially be stopped. Whilst the Adastral Park proposal is a potential location, opportunity exists to improve and expand the existing leisure facilities on MHBp, and provide new opportunities; such existing uses currently provide a diversity of employment opportunity which could be expanded.</p> <p>Insert at the end of the 2nd para of Policy Mar10 to read: '.....to be provided, and could include the use of current employment land in suitable locations to provide a diversity of employment types.'</p>	<p>This would not be appropriate to include within the policy. However, it has been reflected in the supporting text.</p>	No change
		<p>Policy Mar11 Page 47 Children's Play/ Youth Facilities</p> <p>Support – reference should be made to the soft play, bowling alley and Skate park on MHBp as well as Martlesham Leisure and also a private training gym with boxing.</p>	<p>These are private, indoor facilities. The policy is focused on public, outdoor facilities</p>	Text added
		<p>Para 7.2 Page 51 MHBp and the Retail Park need to be included in the sentence.</p> <p>Insert: '.....side of the A12 and Martlesham Village, Martlesham Heath Business Park, Martlesham Heath Retail Park, and the rural....'</p>	<p>Noted</p>	Text added
		<p>Para 7.3 Page 52 The first sentence incorrectly states that the MHBp provides many of services that residents use.</p> <p>Insert a full stop after '...the A12.' Then start a new sentence 'The Retail Park provides.....'</p>	<p>Noted</p>	Text added
		<p>Policy Mar14 Page 61 Cycling/Walking and Disability Access Routes</p> <p>Support</p>		Policy Mar15 Page 62 Cycling Walking and Disability Access in Martlesham Heath Business Park

	Support	Policy Mar16 Page 64 Parking Standards Support Policy Mar17 Page 66 Parking Provision at Martlesham Heath Retail and Business Parks Support	Businesses were approached and were invited to attend the presentation on the findings of the Industrial Survey.	No change	
		<p>Para 8.1 Page 67 MHBPs involvement in survey of industrial areas Whilst a number of the individual businesses may have been informally approached by ward Councillors there is no record of a formal approach to the owners of the estate despite a request being made in writing to this effect which is disappointing given the major role MHBPs plays in the local employment area.</p> <p>Para 8.2 Page 67 Inconsistencies in nos. of businesses Refer to previous comment in Para 2.16 Page 12</p> <p>Para 8.3 Page 68 5th bullet point states 'there are a substantial number of free parking places' and that 'a significant number of local companies indicated that parking for both their customers and employees presented no problems.' Elsewhere in the document parking is considered a problem that needs to be resolved?</p> <p>Clarity and consistency through the document is required as to whether there is or there is not a parking problem in MHBPs as the confusion may put potential companies off from coming to the MHBPs.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This is simply stating what is observed</p>	<p>Text amended</p> <p>No change</p>	
		<p>Para 8.6 Page 69 The para also refers to retail businesses in Martlesham District Centre raising concerns about 'the expansion of large scale retail outlets' at the MH Retail Park that are in direct competition with existing businesses in The Square e.g. the bakery and hairdressers.</p> <p>Firstly, the bakery and hairdressers on MHBPs are not in the Retail Park so unless there are a bakers and hairdressers in the Retail Park this is erroneous statement.</p> <p>Secondly, the bakers and hairdressers at MHBPs are no 'large scale retail outlets'.</p> <p>Thirdly, the baker and hairdressers are not competition for The Square – they serve the local business community on MHBPs as established through the planning process which enabled them to be developed.</p> <p>Remove reference to the bakery and hairdressers.</p> <p>Para 8.6 Page 69 The first sentence refers to 'wider local authorities' Clarity is required as to which 'wider authorities'.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This point is noted about the location of these services. However, whilst the intention of the provision is not to compete but to serve the needs of the businesses there, the fact is that they do.</p>	

		<p>Para 8.7 Page 69 Refers to 'some of the commercial ventures' being concerned about the commercial viability being diluted due to industrial uses being replaced with retail trades.</p> <p>The aim of the management of the MHBp is not to dilute the commercial viability but rather to strengthen it with local services associated and directly aimed at supporting the commercial operators on the site and to attract further investment from existing and new commercial ventures to the area being able to provide a fully serviced business park.</p> <p>There needs to be further clarity in the document regarding the clear distinction between the Retail Park and the MHBp – the two are separate both in terms of use and ownership.</p>	<p>The point about clarity is noted. However, the NP is simply reporting the evidence it gathered.</p>	Text amended
		<p>Policy Mar18 Page 70 General Employment Areas Support</p> <p>Policy Mar19 Page 71 Sandy Lane, Martlesham Support</p> <p>Policy Mar20 Page 74 High Speed Broadband Support</p>	<p>Page 80 Unclear what is meant by 'improve coordination of fragmented interest at MH Retail and Business Parks' means Clarity required.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
46	Charlotte Boyes ALDI	<p>ALDI submission</p> <p>Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission Consultation November 2016</p> <p>On behalf of our client, ALDI Stores Ltd, please find enclosed representations on the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission Consultation document released for consultation in November 2016.</p> <p>As the Parish Council are aware, ALDI are currently promoting proposals for a new neighbourhood ALDI foodstore at Gloster Road (LPA Reference: DC/17/0055/FUL). The proposals will secure a comprehensive and high quality contemporary development, creating 50 new local jobs, which is entirely consistent with the retail and commercial character of the</p>		<p>Text deleted</p>

	<p>surrounding area. The development will also finally secure a substantial economic development solution for the site that has been vacant and providing no output for many years; therefore, ensuring the site starts to contribute to the local economy. The proposals were extensively publicised locally via a community leaflet drop in early October 2016, which received phenomenal support, with almost 90% of respondents welcoming the scheme. Without exception, all supporters welcomed the much needed choice ALDI will bring to Martlesham Heath. A meeting was also held with the Parish Council on Tuesday 27th September and local Ward Councillors on 4th November 2016. A pre-application advice was also received from Officers at Suffolk Coastal District Council in December 2016, all of which have informed our formal submission earlier this month. ALDI are keen to continue to work with Martlesham Parish Council during the planning process and beyond and wish to make the following comments on the Pre-Submission Consultation document: Neighbourhood planning is intended to give communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need. This is a powerful set of tools to help communities get the right types of development for their community.</p>	<p>This point is noted. A new policy has been added to specifically deal with the Martlesham Retail Area which is considered to be consistent with the Local Plan and the NPPF.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and Localism Act 2011 (paragraph 8 of schedule 4B) requires Neighbourhood Plans to be in general conformity with the wider development plan including the Suffolk Coastal's Local Plan and national planning policy guidance. ALDI's community consultation has been conducted in the spirit of localism in order to gauge local opinion and to allow residents to have an opportunity to comment on the proposals before being advanced to a planning submission to Suffolk Coastal District Council. ALDI's proposal site is identified within the Martlesham Heath 'General Employment Area' on the proposed Proposals Map. Therefore, development proposals on this site are subject to draft policy MAR18 'General Employment Areas'. As currently drafted this policy restricts development in this area to use classes B1, B2 and B8. Alternative uses (A1-A3) will be resisted unless viability and marketing evidence is submitted. The NPPF supports out of centre retail development subject to satisfying the sequential approach and retail impact considerations (if greater than 2,500 sqm gross). In this respect the Neighbourhood Plan is not consistent with the NPPF as no reference is made to other retail planning tests and sets its own tests not consistent with the Framework.</p>

	<p>We therefore suggest a small amendment to the definition of employment uses suitable under draft policy MAR18, so that it accords with the NPPF's definition of 'economic development' which recognises development including those within the B Use Classes, public and community uses and main town centre uses (our emphasis added) as employment generating development- see annex 2 glossary of NPPF. This is a clear acknowledgement that the employment market is changing, and employment is known to be generated by other uses in the NPPF. This point is recognised within chapter 8 of the Neighbourhood Plan. The significant role retail plays in the UK economy should not be undervalued and this is already evident in Martlesham Heath.</p> <p>The UK retail sector employs 4.4 million people (15.8% of total workforce) and contributes significantly to total economic output (£180bn in 2014 (11% of total output) (Source: House of Commons Briefing Paper 06186). The sector is clearly a major component of overall employment in the UK and in this respect the NPPF rightly places retail use within the scope of 'economic development' for planning purposes. As such, the general principle of retail development is considered acceptable in employment areas subject to satisfying the sequential test.</p>	<p>I trust that our representations will be given full consideration through the remainder of the consultation process and that our details will be included on the Council's database to ensure we are notified of all future stages of this document. We wish to remain fully involved at every stage in the preparation of the Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan. It should be noted that our views represent our considered opinion at this time, based upon the Pre-submission Consultation Document (November 2016). We respectively reserve the right to make further comments throughout the planning process.</p>	<p>Noted – Comments used to inform SCDC on any requirement for SEA</p>
47	<p>John Jackson Lead Advisor Sustainable Development Natural England</p>	<p>Pre-submission draft plan consultation Reg 14 Thank you for your consultation on the above.</p> <p>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.</p>	

	<p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made..</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>For clarification of any points in this letter, please contact John Jackson on 02080264866</p> <p>For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p> <p>Annex 1 -</p> <p>Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities</p> <p>Natural environment information sources</p> <p>The Magic¹ website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones).</p> <p>Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available here².</p>	

	<p>Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found here³.</p> <p>Most of these will be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, on the Magic website or as Local Wildlife Sites. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p>National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found here⁴.</p> <p>There may also be a local landscape character assessment covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online. If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website. General mapped information on soil types and Agricultural Land Classification is available (under 'landscape') on the Magic⁵ website and also from the LandIS website⁶, which contains more information about obtaining soil data.</p> <p>Natural environment issues to consider The National Planning Policy Framework⁷ sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance⁸ sets out supporting guidance.</p> <p>Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.</p>	

	<p>Landscape</p> <p>Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.</p>	<p>Wildlife habitats</p> <p>Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed here⁹), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Ancient woodland¹⁰. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.</p>	<p>Priority and protected species</p> <p>You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed here¹¹) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice here¹² to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.</p>	<p>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</p> <p>Soil is a finite resource that fulfills many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 112. For more information, see our publication Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most</p>

	<p>versatile agricultural land¹³.</p> <p>Improving your natural environment</p> <p>Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way. • Restoring a neglected hedgerow. • Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site. • Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape. • Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds. • Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings. <p>Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife.</p> <p>Adding a green roof to new buildings.</p> <p>You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure • Strategy (if one exists) in your community. 	

	<p>Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision.</p> <p>Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see Planning Practice Guidance on this¹⁴).</p> <p>Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency).</p> <p>Planting additional street trees.</p> <p>Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links.</p> <p>Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore).</p>	<p>1 http://magic.defra.gov.uk/</p> <p>2 http://www.nbn-nfbr.org.uk/nfbr.php</p> <p>3 http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx</p> <p>4 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making</p> <p>5 http://magic.defra.gov.uk/</p> <p>6 http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm</p> <p>7 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2</p> <p>8 http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/</p>

9				
	<p>http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx</p> <p>10 https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences</p> <p>11 http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx</p> <p>12 https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals</p> <p>13 http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35012</p> <p>14 http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space/local-green-space-designation/</p>	<p>I have carefully read and digested the Overview of Pre-Submission Consultation Document and fully agree with the proposals, outlook etc with regard to housing, open spaces and footpaths community facilities etc.</p> <p>We have been resident in Martlesham Heath since 7 January 1977 and reside in xx Lark Rise being about the '6/17 family to move in. We have watched the village grow and taken a keen interest in the development of what was to be 'A New Village' - seen our village day fete grow from small beginnings to a huge event which unfortunately then became unmanageable, a Christmas service in one of Bidwells Meetings rooms to St Michael's, the 'old green builders hut' which was witness to many a social event, toddlers group, a meeting place for public meetings [the liveliest one being should we have a children's play space behind the Pavilion], and could we have an old goal post on the green . It is still a lovely place to live.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>No change</p>	<p>Text amended</p>
48	John and Maureen Read		General Comments: - although content with the current draft plan if it were possible to further reviewed	

		<p>strengthen policies to ensure adequate off street car parking for both residential and commercial property development that would be good.</p> <p>- it is a great shame that the plan has been forced to exclude the Adastral Park development. I hope that the promises of later involvement in the planning process are kept by Telereal.</p>		
50	David Beaumont	<p>I have already submitted my agreement to your full Neighbourhood Plan document but I wanted to take this opportunity to thank you all for producing what I believe to be a very professional, informative and constructive document.</p> <p>I am aware that this necessary Plan has been produced primarily by dedicated volunteers with some legal assistance and I have been impressed by the quality of the document that can easily be understood by people who are not normal readers of planning documents.</p> <p>From my perspective, it captures all the concerns I have with how the Parish is likely to develop in the coming years and I hope that SCDC accept it and use it as guidance for future planning decisions.</p> <p>Thanks again for your hard work and my I wish you all a Happy New Year.</p> <p>Kind regards I returned my (Green) Neighbourhood Plan response, Agreeing with it, and posting it in the Drop Box in McColls. I didn't actually provide any comments as I believed the existing (Full) document covered all my concerns and I didn't want to delay its ratification.</p> <p>Additional Comments Submitted:</p> <p>For the record, my main concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) That the A12 needs to be MORE "free flowing" if possible to limited air pollution and I believe that if Controlled Crossroads are substituted for the existing roundabouts then traffic will STOP. A more inventive traffic management system needs to be implemented. Possible options are: - keep the existing roundabouts but have 1 traffic light on the straight stretch of road south of Martlesham Heath to cause a "pause" in traffic journeying North, 	<p>Noted</p> <p>No change</p>	<p>CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17</p>

		traffic should have stopped by then, in 15-20 year's time).	
		When is common sense going to prevail?	
		When is SCC Highways going to do their job?	
		When is SCDC Planning going to insist on SCC Highways contributing to the planning process?	
		When is SCC Highways going to get some valid traffic modelling done, because their last attempt in 2008+ was WRONG?	
51	Angus Murray	<p>POLICY MAR2: I do not accept the default position that 'development with normally be permitted" - apart from the visual detraction which it is stated will be avoided, the effects on infrastructure (roads and facilities such as GP surgeries), do not seem to me to have been considered sufficiently; likewise the effects on air and noise pollution. That said, I am not saying there should be no development at all. However, any further housing areas on top of other recently planned/approved developments seems hard to justify.</p> <p>POLICY MAR10: In particular I would support provision of a full size indoor swimming pool.</p> <p>REF POLICY MAR17: I am not convinced this is currently the case eg. regarding proposed Lidl store (which will have only a small car park) and, worse still, is removing much needed overflow parking from Martlesham Leisure (no spaces available when I tried to park there to use the gym on Jan 12th 2017).</p> <p>I strongly support the other policies especially POLICY MAR 14</p>	<p>Discussed by Project Plan Team but agreed that wording should not be amended,</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
52	Claire Allen and William Clark	<p>Parking- the parking on Coopers Road is poor- we have a garage that neither of our cars fit in (VW Polo and Series 1 BMW) and so I park outside the house and my partner parks in front of the garage; everyone on our street does the same so it makes it difficult driving through the cars and when you or people on the street have visitors.</p> <p>Inadequate telecoms- There are only a few slots in the Broadband Fibre box in the exchange for only some houses to have Fibre Broadband- this has recently affected us when we went to change internet providers.</p>	<p>The NP can only address new developments (MAR 16)</p> <p>See MAR 21</p> <p>No change</p>
53	Fiona Hay	I begin with making general comments about the document itself. I then move	

			Text, maps and identification of photos reviewed.	Plan amended
	<p>Overall, I feel very overwhelmed with the way the plan has been written and presented. Some of is written as if it is a technical document rather than an understandable document for the majority of us lay 'parishioners' (e.g. Policy Mar18, 2nd paragraph). It is often awkward to read and to make sense of (e.g. page 7, Policy Mar5). It is full of jargon (many examples) and makes references that most of us have no idea about (e.g. page 11, "Class-A 'retail'; page 7, "Suffolk Coastal Core Strategy Strategic Policy SP3"). I have no idea what the 'Policy MAR' headings refer to. It is not clear whether Martlesham Heath and Martlesham Village are one and the same. It contains words such as 'significantly' without specifying what that actually means - it is left open to interpretation and will mean different things to different people.</p> <p>The plan says that the Adastral Park site falls outside the remit of the Martlesham plan. We are not told why or how this decision was reached by the Council. We know that 2,000 homes are going to be built across the road from the Heath. Given the close proximity to Martlesham Heath residents and the impact the development is going to have (e.g. increase in traffic) on them, it seems extraordinary that no reference is made to the new development. At the very least the plan should say what the intentions are to try and minimise the impact of the new development on the lives of people living on the Heath. Residents of Martlesham Heath need to be involved as much as they can in what happens across the road. They especially need to be involved in any plan for such things as new roads and the placing of traffic lights. The plan should say who is going to work alongside the powers that be to ensure that the impact is analysed and understood e.g. the effect on health given the increase of stationary traffic. We should not ignore what is happening across the road and the plan had the opportunity to be very clear about how the concerns of Martlesham Heath residents were going to be voiced and fed into the system.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Paras 1.10 – 1.14 covers SCDC decision on the Martlesham Plan Area</p>	<p>The scope of neighbourhood plans is legally constrained. It is essential a planning document for future developments – Para 9.1 seeks to explain this. Issues raised by the community outside scope have been captured in the Table 9.1 Non Policy Actions.</p>	
				Text amended

		Heath, it says nothing about the special environment within which we live or the wildlife, flora and fauna with whom we share this environment.	enjoy.	
54	Colin Elmes	Suggestion: Extend existing G.P.Surgery onto tarmac area in front of existing site. It's present location is ideal for aging population of Martlesham Heath and Martlesham, but will create problems of access if surgery moved to Adastral Park area.	Noted – Improvements to medical facilities in the Village Centre supported by MAR 3	Text amended
55	Michael Chenery	<p>Divert footpath around new extension.</p> <p>There is an existing problem with traffic, noise and pollution, on the A12, especially at peak times, as outlined in the plan. With the development of 2000 houses and the retail park near BT this will get much worse. The original plan for expansion shows increased lanes and traffic lights only on the two roundabouts into Martlesham Heath/Retail park. This will create more pollution and congestion with traffic start/stopping even at times of light traffic, at the lights. This needs addressing urgently. Will pollution exceed maximum limits?</p> <p>More thought on this please.</p>	<p>CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17</p> <p>Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and 9.1 Non Policy Actions</p>	No change
56	Mei Cunnell	<p>Firstly, may I congratulate the Team who produced an excellent document within what appears to be the following major constraints.</p> <p>The decision by SCDC to exclude the Adastral Park development from this plan. This decision will no doubt ensure that it will have the same inherent mistakes as the Mill Heath development i.e. high density and style of housing not in keeping with this area or indeed Suffolk. The only local touches being the use of County Cream and Suffolk Pink colouring on some rendered buildings. This is also the first time I have seen in Suffolk a new dwelling with windows already infilled with brick. Finally, as usual the provision of origin parking is insufficient.</p> <p>The SCC guidance regarding origin parking is so way off the mark as to be laughable for a rural County such as Suffolk where the use of a car is a necessity due to both the lack of public transport and the diverse journeys made to a wide-ranging variety of destinations, often at unsocial hours. The use of trade related vans and company cars must also be considered especially with the growing number of self-employed, also the increasing use of private transport for six form and college / University students travelling from outlying villages. Again, I reference Mill Heath and the amount of on street parking caused by the lack of parking space provided for each dwelling. This guidance should be reflecting modern day to ensure that all residents cars can</p>		

	<p>be parked within the curtilage of a dwelling, if not how will electric cars be recharged in the near future. I accept that developers will adhere to the minimum standards but we need to up the minimum standard if we are to reduce on street parking and reduce the risk of blocking access required by emergency vehicles.</p> <p>The apparent lack of Management vision shown by the various Highways bodies to ensure sufficient road access on and off new developments. There is also an obvious lack of recognition that the A12 at Martlesham is already at capacity at peak times. When considered with the current lack of parking and considerable congestion on the Industrial area, if substantial improvements are not made to the A12 and feeder roads, including measures to improve traffic flow into and out of the Industrial area and the destination parking provision within this area before the start of the Adastral Park Development it will eventually detract from companies relocating and customers going onto the Martlesham Industrial area resulting in a loss of income and jobs to the surrounding area. There appears to be no forward plan to deal with the increased A12 traffic caused by additional Industrial development, the Adastral Park development, general increase of holiday traffic caused by more staycation holidays, the development of Sizewell C the periodic closure of the Orwell bridge and the eventual building of the Ipswich Northern Bypass. Note – Roundabouts with traffic lights is not the answer!</p> <p>Many of the statistics available for well informed decisions to be based are out of date and do not appear to paint an accurate picture of the current situation. Turning to the area covered by the actual Neighbourhood Plan I would make the following comments regarding the award-winning area of Martlesham Heath. (An excellent example which could and should be followed by all future developments in this area).</p>	<p>CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17 Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and 9.1 Non Policy Actions</p>	No change
		<p>No new development should be allowed including the areas suggested in Figure 4.1 of the 'Pre-Submission Consultation Version November 2016' document. As far as I recollect neither of these areas were in the original plan and should therefore be rejected and removed from this document as a proposal which is an attempt to erode the character of the Heath for no other motive than financial gain by outside interests.</p> <p>The current arrangements and controls that exist for modifying existing properties must not be relaxed as suggested.</p> <p>Concerning the provision and use of dedicated or shared cycle/pedestrian paths I believe we need to be clear who may use cycle paths i.e. are these paths provided for use by electric bikes and road going mobility scooters, if so,</p>	<p>Noted – covered in MAR 1 and 2</p> <p>Noted see MAR 14</p> <p>No change</p>

		these paths will become mini roads with increased speeds and risks to users. I also believe that there is currently sufficient provision of A12 crossing points to/from the Heath and any additional crossing points providing access to/from the Heath must not be permitted.	Planning permission granted by SCDC. No change	
		Considering Martlesham Village I feel the developments already in train including the one at the end of Black Tiles Lane do not contribute to enhancing or indeed maintaining the character of the Village. I also think that a firm urgent grip needs to be taken with the 'Industrial Site' around the Sandy Lane area which appears to be an eyesore and totally uncontrolled.	MAR 20 covers development and re-use of buildings in Sandy Lane. From comments received the Plan has been reviewed and amendments made to text where appropriate, Noted	Text amended
		In conclusion, I would wish to see the draft MNP amended to reflect the comments above, specifically changes made regarding comments A, B and C above before it is presented for further consideration. Furthermore, if changes are not forthcoming I will consider voting against adoption of the plan. Finally, I wish the development team good luck with concluding this exercise but fear that factors outside their remit will overshadow all their efforts.	Covered in 1.10 – 1.14	No change
57	Paul Jordan	1.13 Indicate that exclusion of the Adastral development area was against the wishes of the Parish Council and many residents. A good document - well done.	Having read through the plan summary and attended one of the drop-in sessions, We have the following comments: 1) We are generally supportive of the plan, and am happy that the draft NP be presented for examination at the end of the consultation period. 2) We agree that Martlesham needs more smaller properties (2 or 3-bedrooms, and bungalows). However, in-fill within the physical limits boundary will not deliver the number of properties needed, even if developers can be persuaded not to build yet more detached executive homes. It is essential that smaller properties be a key part of the BT development. In this respect it is perverse of SCDC to insist this part of Martlesham cannot be included in the Martlesham Neighbourhood plan. Why? 3) There will clearly be pressure from developers to build on the area of land bounded by Old Felixstowe Road, Three Stiles Lane, the AONB and BT. It is essential that SCDC take serious account policy MA2, which to us seems	Responses from our survey used to inform CEG. MAR 2 reviewed and wording strengthened Text amended

59	Robert Jones	<p>weak protection.</p> <p>4) This also applies to the open land that separates Martlesham from Woodbridge, Old Martlesham from Martlesham Heath and Martlesham Heath from Kesgrave. Each of these areas has it's distinctive character. Similarly, there should be a local gap between Old Martlesham and the new BT development. Development that creates a single suburban sprawl from Ipswich to Melton would seriously detract from the overall attractiveness of the area. It becomes a long ribbon development. To preserve the ancient village there should be no further development between Lamb Barn Hill to Home Meadow leading up to Woodbridge.</p> <p>5) There is a serious shortage of parking in the retail/ industrial park. This can only get worse as more of the site is developed and existing premises move from industrial to retail use. In the long term refusal to take the parking problems seriously will backfire: people use out of town shopping centres because parking is readily available. If the parking isn't there, they'll go elsewhere.</p> <p>6) Although not part of the plan, I welcome the comments concerning access to Woodbridge. There is a serious need for a safe way to walk into Woodbridge, especially at night. There are over-grown hedges between Martlesham bridge leading to railway. And no pavement along Sandy Lane or past Top Street. We are a walkers and we very much welcome public footpath many as possible. This has a long term health benefit to residents.</p> <p>1. Traffic levels on the Old Felixstowe Road, coupled with very poor road surface near Crown Point and at the junction with Anson Road, make this an extremely dangerous road to cycle along, especially in poor weather. The primary reason why traffic levels are high is due to the abysmal design of the roundabout near the Police HQ, forcing traffic to find alternative routes. Consideration should be given to making (part of) the road one-way (for cars only) therefore allowing more space for cyclists. (And changing the design of the Police HQ roundabout – getting rid of the traffic lights would be a big improvement. I know this is out of your scope, but.....)</p> <p>2. As mentioned in the document, I fully agree a safe cycle route to Woodbridge would be a huge improvement.</p> <p>3. Many trees (mostly Silver Birch) have been cut down on the Retail Park within the last year. I have seen no new trees being planted. The character of the area has been diminished by the loss of these trees. There should be some incentive/encouragement to replace trees with as least as many as have been removed. (Comment already submitted at the Beacon Hill session.)</p>	<p>As above MAR 2</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Agreed new developments covered by MAR 17 and existing issues captured in Table 9.1 Non policy actions.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	

		4. Can't find any references to lighting (street or otherwise), but if applicable, it should be non-polluting as far as possible (ie light should be where required, not blotting out the night sky). And preferably turned off at quiet hours.	This is not a planning matter, it is related to highways. It has been added as a non-policy action.	Text added
		Overall this is an excellent document, capturing many of the existing issues, and proposing sensible proposals for the future. My congratulations for all the hard work that has obviously gone into its production. Good luck in making it work!		
60	Martlesham Parish Council	It was formally minuted at the January 2017 PC meeting:	Noted	
61	Brother Herman	<p>"That the Parish Council, as a whole, endorses the Pre-submission draft of the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan" (Resolution C2017/1e).</p> <p>My comments are as follows :</p> <p>More houses are a good thing. However, please make nicer ones with actual room around them. This also includes parking spaces. A 4 bedroom house should have decent space for three cars minimum as an example. It would eliminate the cars parking on streets problem.</p> <p>Roads need to be updated and in some cases changed to allow for much more traffic. This also could be worked into finally making a Northern Bypass for Ipswich which is probably 20 years overdue.</p> <p>More retail outlets would be a good thing, perhaps in the style of Futura Park in Nacton.</p> <p>High-Speed Telecoms are a must.</p> <p>Green Park areas are nice, however allotments are a waste of time.</p> <p>New Services such as a Doctor and School would be required</p>	Comments noted	No change
62	Bruce Boxall	Thank you for all the hard work that has gone into a very useful document.	2 comments	<p>Noted – Policy MAR 9/10 and 11 reviewed</p> <p>Noted but outside remit of the</p>

		to live. Hence high quality retail areas should be encouraged to locate in Martlesham retail areas	NP	
63	John Button	<p>Whilst I am reasonably content with the contents of the proposed plan,, i really cannot accept that such a document can be supported and proposed without the ability to comment / advise on the effect of the proposals on the local infrastructure, road network, communications etc.</p> <p>I accept that these are outside the absolute influence of the PC – but surely the Plan should include a commentary on the requirements for such major items going forward . How can these issues be considered properly in isolation?</p>	CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17 Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and 9.1 Non Policy Actions	No change
64	J Miller	<p>Having read through the MNP full document I am happy for the draft NP to be presented but wish to ask that certain matters outside the scope of the plan could be stressed to the construction/ highways/ planners or whoever has the final say.</p> <p>1. The range of housing is essential or Martlesham may consist of only large well off families</p> <p>3. Road inadequacies be addressed, at the present time the roads cannot cope with traffic heaven knows what chaos/pollution 2000 houses with potential for over 2000 cars will cause</p>	See MAR 5 – Residential Mix	No change CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17 Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and 9.1 Non Policy Actions
		<p>21. The doctors surgery to remain in its present form and situation for those less able to travel to the new medical centre or for those living within walking distance of the present surgery</p> <p>Other than the above comments the plan in its present form is excellent and hopefully will carry forward in its present form.</p> <p>Regarding the neighbourhood plan proposed for Martlesham we would like to make the following comments for your consideration.</p>	Supported in MAR 3 Text revised	
65	John and Julie Hammond			

			Covered in MARs 3, 4 AND 5	No change
	<p>1) We would like to see any proposed housing plans follow the same pattern as Martlesham Heath, ie lots of open green spaces with different designs and similar density as we already enjoy. What we would not like to see lots of Lego boxes with no character and cramming in as many houses as possible with few green spaces.</p> <p>2) Properly thought out infrastructure not moving traffic problems somewhere else and speed limits introduced on the two A12 roundabouts of 50mph to slow traffic down approaching busy intersections.</p> <p>3) Schools and medical facilities to cope with already stretched services.</p> <p>We hope our thoughts are reflected on any final planning decisions.</p>	<p>CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17 Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and 9.1 Non Policy Actions</p> <p>CEG submission – Education Statement Report. Extending medical facilities in Martlesham Heath village centre supported in MAR 3</p>	<p>MAR 3 Text amended.</p>	
66	Philip Wilmot	<p>Please find below my comments on the Martlesham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Overview of Pre-Submission Consultation Document, which I understand to be a summary of the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan itself. I have attempted to show the specific sections in the document that I am commenting on, followed by the comment itself.</p> <p>Please treat my comments as matters for consideration and discussion only: none of my comments justifies delaying presentation of the NP at the end of the consultation period, and I do appreciate the hard work that has gone into the NP hitherto.</p> <p>The vision for Martlesham</p>	<p>The vision may be too broad. Within a relatively small area such as Martlesham, less the excluded areas, it would not be unreasonable to expect there to be a limit to the range of residential accommodation, and to the type and scale of businesses to be encouraged through the provision of types of commercial premises and infrastructure. Is there a risk that the general statements made here could, assuming that the NP is adopted, be used by the</p>	<p>The Vision Statement was developed after wide consultation and adopted by the Parish Council.</p>

		LPA to justify the granting of permission for unpopular developments such as, to give an extreme example, a traveller site?	This policy has been simplified to only relate to Martlesham Heath. The wording provides flexibility and it is not appropriate to use such a policy to seek to prevent 'garden grabbing'. Policy MAR4 addresses such matters.	MAR 2 text amended	
	THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROCESS	Elements of POLICY MAR2 are very subjective, though this may not easily be addressable. It is perhaps worthwhile to have this policy in order to militate against garden-grabbing in which one or more existing dwellings is demolished in order to build new properties providing higher density accommodation, but might this policy inadvertently make it awkward for people wishing to build extensions? (I'm unsure of the power that LPAs currently have over these following relatively recent changes in the law, but any such changes could at some point be reversed).	More generally, given the apparent desire to increase the diversity of the housing stock within the area falling within the scope of the plan, will the NP seek to avoid the current problem becoming worse by attempting to discourage the LPA from permitting extensions when it has the power to do so? I am not advocating such a policy but simply highlighting it as a potential possibility.	There is a policy addressing housing mix and type (MAR 5) but matters such as Starter Homes are now classified as affordable housing which is a strategic matter and therefore outside the remit of the NP.	
	HOUSING	Weaknesses to be addressed: 1. Lack of smaller starter properties and 2. Lack of properties suitable for downsizing	See comments under 'The vision for Martlesham' above. Whilst undeniably true, is this a weakness or merely a feature? Do adjacent areas compensate for the lack of starter properties in Martlesham and if so, does this matter? Also, won't the LPA be able to insist that any current lack of starter properties in Martlesham is addressed when land to the south and east of Adastral Park is developed?	7. Inadequate broadband Is this really the case now that Fibre to the Cabinet has been deployed? (Look East Late News did broadcast an item on 25/1/2016 about someone in Swan Close having problems but I would be surprised if there isn't a straightforward explanation). One might also add the following weaknesses: . conflict caused by parking on private land on Martlesham Heath, the	No change See Policy MAR 21 – High Speed Broadband

	<p>use of which is supposedly governed by restrictive covenants that are very difficult to enforce.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proportion of properties that have garages in blocks separate from the principal plot. - the prevalence of pedestrian paths that on occasion attract disruptive or antisocial behaviour. - the presence of combined cycle and pedestrian paths that compromise users' safety (particularly the one linking Eagle Way and Broomfield, which includes the kerb build-out across Broomfield that while probably essential for overall safety, is signed ambiguously vis à vis right of way, and is an inconvenience to residents living between it and the end of Broomfield). <p>Few if any of the aforementioned weaknesses are addressable within the existing built environment but I do understand that noting them may guide any future development in avoiding a repetition.</p>	<p>Covenants are held by MHHL - all residents of Martlesham Heath are members of the Association.</p>
	<p>COMMUNITY FACILITIES What we are proposing POLICY MAR11: PROVISION OF CHILDREN'S PLAY AND YOUTH FACILITIES</p> <p>In general I would be concerned if the NP were to make it easier for the LPA to permit the development of further youth facilities. I'm unsure of the details but it is well known that a hut for the use of the local youth in Kesgrave became, and for all I know still is, a major problem for nearby householders and indeed for the police.</p> <p>GETTING AROUND Strengths 3. High rate of use of bicycles</p> <p>Up to a point the apparently high usage of bicycles is indeed a strength, but bear in mind that much of this use is not by residents but by people commuting to Adastral Park or to the industrial area, and it causes its own problems particularly on paths that are shared with pedestrians.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>2. Conflict; as described is also a fact of life on the path linking Eagle Way and Broomfield.</p> <p>What we are proposing . . . Proposals to address the following priority routes will be strongly supported:</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		<p>I may have missed the point here, but surely access to Woodbridge for cyclists at least is already available via Top Street and Ipswich Road, though the hills may act as a disincentive. I cannot however see how access to Woodbridge from Martlesham that uses neither Sandy Lane nor Top Street and Ipswich Road can be provided without the construction of a new dedicated route.</p> <p>Matters outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Under item 2 in the list the Recycling Centre (aka Foxhall Tip) surely merits an explicit mention.</p>	<p>Agreed there are existing cycle routes but these are considered dangerous due to heavy traffic, blind corners and roundabouts.</p> <p>Foxhall Tip is outside the neighbourhood plan area.</p>	
67	Thomas Davies	<p>Having received your document in regard to the local neighbourhood development through my door yesterday. I have been reading through it and find it amusing and convenient to see that two areas have been excluded from the proposed neighbourhood area that are currently looking likely to be built on! Also the area isn't big enough as anything that's developed outside these areas still directly affects the community. People should have more of a vote on anything large scale that would directly affect them. Having lived in this area for over 30 years now I have seen the urbanisation of an previously suburban/rural pleasant area. This area does not require any more large developments of houses or shops! The reason so many people choose to live here is down to the environment and open spaces. These need to be protected for the long term and for future generations. The amount of traffic volumes have increased massively with no improvements made to any of the road networks. This problem has been highlighted several times recently with the closure of the Orwell bridge and road works along Kesgrave Main road. Also I have concerns about further noise and light pollution from more developing. I don't have a problem with subtle and thought through building and I appreciate that houses are required, but there comes a time when no more can be built in one area. I would like to see an effort put into protecting the environment and wildlife that we have around here that inevitably suffer and get pushed further and further out.</p> <p>I certainly will be making the effort to attend one of the public displays.</p>	<p>The Parish Council regularly advertise for volunteers to come forward to serve.</p>	
68	Guy Russell	<p>I have a passion for this wonderful area and would like to be part of a team or parish that can determine the future of the area.</p> <p>The whole document has been written so weakly I am afraid even I could negotiate my way around all your desired outcomes and provide the</p>		

		Policies reviewed to strengthen wording.	Text amended
	<p>community with a worthless but compliant master plan.</p> <p>Amendments I would like to see:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The wording of the document to be strengthened. Phrases such as should provide, strongly supported, supported, to demonstrate that..., are so weak that developers will get around them with ease. We MUST use phrases such as SHALL provide, MUST improve etc. etc. 2. What happens if there is no proposal forthcoming that can be "strongly supported"? What happens if there are no proposals to improve cycle and pedestrian routes? What happens if the developers do not "seek to....." The parish council will have nothing to strongly support or otherwise. 3. The master plan for Grange Farm was a shocker from the outset. It is only Ropes Drive where two way traffic may pass without negotiating parked cars littering the highway. Policy MAR16 parking standards; why aspire to the "minimum vehicle and cycle parking standards"? This is setting out a plan to fail. Re write it to say the developer SHALL BETTER minimum parking standards by 100% or 200%. Perhaps then we will have all cars and all visitors off the highway making any new development a pleasure to traverse and visit. 	<p>The NP cannot insist on standards above existing statutory policies.</p> <p>The scope of neighbourhood plans is defined by law.</p>	
69	<p>Lesley & Peter Roberts</p>	<p>Under the heading:- Housing Strengths to be protected - there should be a third item.</p> <p>Following receipt of the Neighbourhood Plan we would like to make the following comments:-</p> <p>3. Protecting existing neighbourhoods from over-development i.e. backland</p>	

		Wording of MAR 4 reviewed	Text amended
	development, tandem building and garden grabbing Example	This has clearly been demonstrated by planning permission being granted to build a property to the rear of No.6 Black Tiles Lane which sides onto Angela Close. Other nearby residents in Main Road have seen what financial gain there is on offer by selling off their back gardens and trying to gain access into Angela Close. To date there have been four planning permissions refused and another which went to appeal has also been refused and a further appeal is still outstanding.	
		This has been very stressful for the majority of the residents of Angela Close who are totally against these proposals as it will alter our Street Scene resulting in cramped forms of development, out of character with the existing properties and will spoil what is a very pleasant, quiet Close to live in. The Parish Council has been supportive of our objections. Therefore, we think the above additional statement or something similar should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.	
70	Marianne Lock	Whilst the proposals look reasonable for the development of Martlesham, the major issues of road inadequacies, traffic, parking and transport and comprehensive surgery facilities are not being addressed. It seems impossible to grow Martlesham at all without these items being considered and resolved. Martlesham, for me, is beginning to lose the enchantment that it had always had. With continual traffic problems, lack of parking for new retail units, new housing developments it no longer has a village feel. If the traffic issues could be resolved it would help enormously. Without some investment in the road network and some strong policies I can't see it happening. For the first time in living here for nearly 20 years I am contemplating moving out of the area, which is very sad as I've always loved it here.	CEG submission for the development of the land to the south and east of Adastral Park include proposals for Highway Mitigation – Ref 10391 – HL 02, 04, 05, 06, 11,22,23,24,25,26 and 17 Future developments in Martlesham covered by MAR 14,15,16 and 17 and 9.1 Non Policy Actions Surgery facilities covered in MAR3
71	Tincombe	On Page 8 you have said that a weakness to be addressed is a small GP surgery putting pressure on health services. There is no proposal to ease this issue. It is hard enough to get an appointment at the surgery and increasing facilities will just put more strain on this, Can there be another surgery on the Heath? Can we expand the one we have? This has not been addressed at this time.	Improvements to medical facilities supported by MAR 3
	Ian White	I am broadly in agreement with this draft however, I am somewhat skeptical	Noted

72				
73	Powling	Page 12 "weaknesses to be addressed"	Agreed – add bullet point to 7.1 Text amended	
		4/ "Excessive traffic on Sandy Lane"- should include ...and Top Street, Lion Hill and old Felixstowe Road from Crown Point to Arson Road, which is seen by non-villagers as a convenient rat run to miss the traffic lights at the Park & Ride roundabout.		
		The only traffic the expensive by-pass stopped was the heavy vehicles. So to me this is something that must be addressed from the outset.		
74	Marks	Comments: I love living in Martlesham Heath but weaknesses: Broadband – The speed is woefully low.	See MAR 21 – High Speed Broadband Out of scope for NP - Highways	
		Cycling provision - The so called "cycle priority route" of Old Felixstowe Rd is anything but. Overgrown hedges, non- existant or faded road markings, dreadful pot-holed surface at Crown Point end is dangerous. I have repeatedly requested SDC to rectify this, but no promise yet. The road is more of a rat run for motorists from Woodbridge,	Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan.pdf/ 8	
75	Hilary Hanslip – Principal Planner – Policy and Delivery (Neighbourhood Plans) Suffolk Coastal & Waveney District Council.	Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan – Pre Submission Consultation Version (Nov 2016) 1.1 The current wording is misleading and could be wrongly misconstrued. Amend final sentence to read “..., and once “made”, this Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted Change made	Noted, although it is not considered appropriate to say what the document doesn't do Changes made

	<p>Core Strategy. It introduces the fact that later in the document reference will be made to replacing/updating earlier “saved” policies. You might also want to state at this point the things the NP does not do ie amend AONB boundaries.</p>	because this will inevitably miss things
1.8	The relevant authority under the Regulations is the Martlesham Parish Council. Add sentence to clarify the fact that responsibility for producing the neighbourhood plan is Martlesham Parish Council. The preparation of the plan has been undertaken by the MNPG.	Noted Change made
1.9	Use of terminology. Given that the NP is intended to be a formal planning document, might want to consider changing use of the word “...MNPG felt”, with “...it was considered that the plan area should ...”	Noted Change made
1.13	Update re Adastral Park For consistency, the next version of the plan should provide an update with regard to progress with Adastral Park and the pre-application submission consultation which has commenced.	Noted Change made
1.17	Final sentence. Need to ensure that this actually followed through. Careful proof reading of the next version of the plan will ensure that these references are identified. It is something that neighbourhood plan examiners will pick up on.	Noted Various additions made throughout NP Change made
2.13	Additional clarification suggested. Not everyone will know what district centre is or what uses it is likely to contain. Add example to end of sentence “...has been the provision of services normally associated with a district centre such as hairdressers or bakery within the industrial estate....”	Noted Changes made
2.14	Clarification / update Additional sentence or footnote to clarify that Adastral Park within the fence is not part of the neighbourhood plan area but strong relationship with remainder	Noted Changes made

	<p>of the employment area. Might want to think about adding a reference in this section and that for retail and commercial leisure as to what the relevant use classes are. This is a planning document so use classes are important.</p> <p>2.17 Clarification Assume the reference to 7,000 employees covers all employment types referenced in this section but including the retail and leisure uses. Ensure section references any new planning permissions not yet built.</p>	<p>No change Noted but sentence makes clear that the 7,000 figure is employment in the whole of the parish.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>Box Industrial Areas Question. Under weaknesses, have any issues been identified which might be an issue for example in relation to the juxtaposition of individual uses albeit that they may be good neighbours in terms of use classes.</p> <p>Question. The text refers to inadequate car parking. Is it just car parking or is it parking more generally. Is the issue inadequate car parking resulting in on-street parking</p> <p>Provide additional explanation dependent on answers to questions posed.</p>	<p>No Also HGVs</p>	<p>Also HGVs</p>	<p>Clarification added</p>	<p>Clarification added</p>
	<p>2.18 – 2.23 and box</p>	<p>Clarification and expansion. This is the section which should pick up on matters relating to open space in its widest sense. Policies are proposed later in the plan to replace AP212 and AP214. Alternatively, consideration could be given to including a section on the environment and responsibilities in that regard – this may just be acknowledging what exists and stating that policies relating to this are to be found in the Core Strategy eg AONB.</p> <p>(Note this would provide the introduction to item 3 in the Vision)</p> <p>This section contains much useful information in terms of open space and footpaths. Not everyone knows the area, therefore the provision of this information in map form would be useful. Also, if the purpose of the plan is to look to improve/ upgrade these facilities as and when planning applications are determined, then a map would provide the evidence to argue for such improvements or new links.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Changes made Map added</p>	<p>Changes made</p>
		<p>The provision of open space and opportunities for dog walking etc away from the estuary is also an important part of the core</p>	<p>Noted</p>		

			Text deleted
2.31	Clarification final bullet point. See earlier comments. It would be useful to know what the leisure activities are that they are referring to. Going to the cinema for example would be out of area. You need to know whether or not those leisure activities are something that the NP could or could not address. Management of a particular facility is not a matter for the neighbourhood plan. Alternatively if it is an activity which could potentially be addressed through new provision as part of the Adastral Park development, then the NP could usefully state that this is how it would seek to address the matter.	Deleted as it cannot be addressed by NP	
2.32	<p>Clarification for those not familiar with the area.</p> <p>Suggest provide explanation in terms of the A12 and its wider importance to the district. Make reference to fact that junction improvements are proposed in conjunction with the Adastral Park development (within and outside of neighbourhood plan area).</p> <p>Could be highlighted as an issue for discussion with developers/agents to see what if anything can be done to alleviate existing situation re noise/pollution. Any reference to noise pollution or air pollution would need to be backed up by evidence.</p>	Text amended Agreed to reflect wider role of A12. But not suitable to state that junction improvements are proposed – the issue raised is one of road noise and such improvements are not going to improve that situation.	
3.3	<p>Factual update</p> <p>This paragraph will need to be updated in the next version of the plan to reflect that these consultations have commenced.</p>	Text amended Noted	
4.1 / 4.2	<p>Clarification. The plan should make clear that physical limits boundaries have been reviewed and re-drafted.</p> <p>If appropriate proposals map may need to be updated to reflect latest planning permissions.</p>	Text amended Noted	
MAR2	<p>Information is provided in relation to Martlesham Heath. Any other identified sites should similarly evidenced.</p> <p>Similar information should be provided in respect of any areas other than Martlesham Heath which policy MAR2 is proposed to apply.</p>	Policy amended It is accepted that no other areas can be specifically identified so the second part of the policy should be removed	

	MAR3 The supporting text to this policy provides an indication of the type of uses which might be acceptable but this is not replicated in the policy itself. Amend the policy to include specific reference to the type of uses which will be supported. As written the policy is insufficiently clear. 5.2 This paragraph is factually incorrect. No new housing is proposed for allocation within the neighbourhood plan area. Adjacent to the neighbourhood plan area development is proposed at Adastral Park. No sites have been identified in Woodbridge.	Noted	Policy text amended
	Table pg 31 Column 1 – changes at the national level mean that the reference to affordable housing on sites of 6 dwellings or more is now incorrect. The new threshold is over 10 units.	Noted	Text amended
	Pg 32 Middle column. In respect of the current local plan, housing for Woodbridge will be provided through the site at Woods Lane. In addition, it is likely that new housing will be provided on the former council offices site at Melton Hill. Amend reference to Woodbridge to reflect Woods Lane permission and former council offices site. Column 3 you might want to add a reference to the fact that no new housing allocation is identified for Martlesham in the Core Strategy and table supporting policy SSP1 of the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Document (January 2017)	Noted	Text amended
	5.5 Infill is normally taken to mean less than five units and usually only one or two. Is there any evidence to suggest that 5 or 6 units is normal for Martlesham? The reference to “supported” housing should be defined. Amend if appropriate to define infill. Include a definition as to what is meant by “supported” housing.	Noted	Text deleted Should be sheltered housing

MAR4	Bullet point 10. The reference to "sufficient" is imprecise. Bullet point 12 – the reference to low carbon sustainable design is also imprecise. Reference should be made to relevant parking standards. If a higher standard is to be applied than is currently required under the Building Regulations evidence is required as to what that standard should be and should be checked against latest government guidance. The policy should be viability tested to see what if any additional cost such a requirement would place on an development.	Noted Noted MAR5 and supporting text The opportunities for new housing within the NP area will be limited. The identified need for smaller dwellings is something which the NP can confirm it will feed into discussions on Adastral Park The plan needs to be realistic in terms of what is likely to occur with regard to new housing provision. The housing mix in the Core Strategy really relates to sites of five or more units.	Text amended Text amended No change
MAR6		Noted but if larger sites do come forward within Martlesham Heath, then they provide an opportunity to address the need for smaller dwellings.	No change
MAR7		It is considered that the policy is consistent with the Deben Estuary Plan and also with other submitted NP's.	No change
6.5 and MAR8	This paragraph should also reference policy SP15 of the Core Strategy	Noted – it is	Text amended

	<p>– Landscape and Townscape. Policy MAR8 implements policy SP15 by identifying the area to which it relates. In doing so it replaces policy AP13 in this location.</p> <p>Add reference to Core Strategy policy SP15 and confirm that policy MAR8 replaces “saved” policy AP13 as it applies to this site.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Text amended</p>
MAR9	<p>The intent behind this policy is understood but query whether or not the policy as written would achieve the desired outcome. If the facility to be replaced is not fit for purpose (too small, badly configured) or does not provide the space to meet current needs would the policy support new, more suitable provision? Is the policy required or could the same outcome be achieved if a scheme were to be determined against objectives and policies in the Core Strategy? There is no reference in the policy to the need for car parking or for access via means other than by foot.</p> <p>Re-consider the wording of this policy to ensure that it correctly reflects the desired outcome.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Core Strategy policies don't take account of the impact of the loss of a facility on that particular community. For example, Policy DM32 requires consideration of 'the availability of comparable facilities elsewhere'. This would likely be outside Martlesham given the limited number of existing facilities.</p>
MAR10	<p>As currently worded, this policy would be very difficult to apply should an application for a new leisure use be received. If a leisure use is open to people other than the local community would it still attract support?</p> <p>Given the scale of development currently proposed for Martlesham NP area, what new leisure provision is thought likely to come forward over the plan period? Is it more a case of existing facilities such as the village hall may be re-developed? If this is the case existing policies would support retention of the site in that use. If a new provision is anticipated linked to Adastral Park and the issue is then one of access for the existing population, this is a different matter. Same issues in relation to parking provision and access via means other than by foot (paragraph 2) including public transport.</p> <p>Potentially delete policy.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This appears to misunderstand the policy. Whether a use is open to people from outside the area is not a consideration.</p> <p>There could be such facilities proposed on sites such as the car park or the Police HQ in Martlesham Heath.</p> <p>The issue of cycling and walking linkages is noted and has been addressed.</p>
MAR11	<p>If there are specific proposals to upgrade facilities then these should be</p>	

	<p>listed in the policy. This will provide the evidence against which CIL funding can be argued.</p> <p>Policy needs to be more specific in terms of improvements sought where these are known. If there is to be a skatepark, then the policy could make reference to working with the community to identify a suitable site for such provision. From the supporting text, it looks as though such provision could potentially be in another NP area.</p>	<p>This is noted but the policy does not have to be more specific. The meaningful proportion of CIL that comes directly to the Parish Council can be spent on anything it sees fit, provided it addresses the needs arising from growth.</p>	No change
	<p>MAR12 and supporting text</p> <p>For this policy to be workable, additional information should be provided to evidence the level of allotment/community growing space required. In practice, given that no new housing is proposed as part of the neighbourhood plan, and unlikely to come forward within the policies in the adopted Core Strategy this policy would appear redundant. If the proposal is for allotment/community growing space to be provided for the benefit of the parish more widely, then a reference to support for new provision linked to a masterplan for Adastral Park would be more appropriate. It would still need to be evidenced.</p> <p>Delete policy as written. Amend text to support such provision through the masterplan for Adastral Park if that is what is intended. Reference would still be required to the evidence to support this. If land has been identified as suitable for new allotment provision within the NP area, then this could be the subject of a specific allocation.</p>	<p>Disagree. The policy is simply encouraging (rather than requiring) the use of community growing spaces. These do not require much land and can be provided in any new development. General support for allotment provision is not considered to require evidence of existing deficits. The increase in population from new development will create additional demand for allotment space.</p>	<p>The section does not address designated heritage assets and archaeology because there is already a satisfactory policy framework in place for this which the NP could not add to. The focus of this section is on particular non-designated heritage assets.</p>

	compliant with requirements in NPPF.	The need to re-word the policy to be compliant with the NPPF is noted. The policy has been narrowed to only focus on buildings or structures of character and has used similar wording to that used in other NPs that have passed examination.	Summary provided	
	<p>Getting Around Section 7</p> <p>This section is important to the NP and the identification of existing issues, problems and opportunities. It is an important section in that access and getting around will be an important component in terms of how the proposed development at Adastral Park can link and integrate with the existing communities. Integration is a np objective.</p> <p>The section could benefit from a holistic overview (summary form) of issues and opportunities which later policies might apply. MAR15 for example might be viewed as addressing current issues of legibility when moving around the retail park.</p>	<p>The earlier section of the NP makes reference to the fact that Martlesham is now (for a variety of reasons) a destination in its own right. Other evidence is provided in the employment section as to the numbers of people employed within the NP plus Adastral Park area. There are issues linked to the changes which have happened in recent times within the retail area (since the change of use to Next) which also have an impact and movement within and around the industrial /commercial area. Adastral Park development will raise its own issues in terms of traffic generation and how that will be dealt with, including improvements to the highway network, public transport etc.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	We have added in a summary of the issues. But the purpose of the section is to state how these issues might be addressed and it is considered
		Drawing on the above facts, it would be useful to use this introductory section on Getting About set out here what the key issues are eg short bullet points. The analysis of the key points might/might not be possible to address through the NP and specific planning policies which follow. It might be that the NP sets out an approach as to a desired end result and how this might be achieved, who would need to be involved. Suggest use the first part of the section to identify	Policy amended	

	the key issues related to getting about, how these might be addressed and who would need to be involved.	that it does this as drafted.
MAR14	<p>Much of this policy is aspirational. It is unclear from the text as to what discussions have been held with the highway authority and what is likely to be realistic in terms of provision within the timeframe of the plan. The views of the highway authority of this policy will be important. The approved cycle route from Martlesham to Woodbridge is via Sandy Lane. The relevant bullet point should be deleted.</p>	<p>This is ties up intrinsically with anything that happens with Adastral Park. Clearly the provision of new crossings of the A12 is unlikely to happen without that development. So discussions with the highway authority also need to be held with the promoters of Adastral Park. As part of previous discussions these issues have been raised and have been considered to have potential by the promoters. SCC has raised no objection to the draft NP.</p> <p>Sandy Lane is still considered to be unsafe for cyclists, therefore it is considered appropriate to seek alternatives.</p> <p>Additional text added</p>
	<p>MAR 15 and supporting text</p> <p>This section would benefit from additional analysis as to what potential solutions might be possible. Provision of signage could be one option. The text makes no reference to the ease or otherwise of public transport provision in this area. Re-visit policy wording to ensure that issues relating to legibility of movement within and around the area is also incorporated. Expand text to include reference to public transport issues.</p>	<p>Such solutions involve highway modelling which is outside the scope of what an NP groups can achieve. As the section makes clear though, what is being sought is quite straightforward – crossing points and dropped kerbs to allow disability scooters to cross. It would be unwise, given the expansion plans, to be overly precise about where</p> <p>No change</p>

MAR16/17 Are these policies required given Core Strategy policy DM19? Consider deleting the policies.	<p>and what provision should be made. It is not clear as to why the policy should be expanded to cover public transport; this was not an issue raised by the community.</p> <p>Disagree. MAR16 seeks to bring these standards into policy and provides more guidance on the type of off-street provision that is supported, which DM19 does not do. MAR17 relates to a very specific issue caused by a very large out-of-town retail development which is adjacent to a large industrial area. The parking standards are not addressing a problem which is why MAR17 is required.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>An additional policy is added to cover the retail area, with the existing MAR18 policy solely focused on industrial.</p>
	<p>MAR18 and supporting text</p> <p>This section needs further detailed consideration. The designation of the retail and business park as a general employment area does not reflect the existing situation. The objective for this area must be for it to remain a vibrant thriving employment and retail area. In order to achieve this, separate policy approaches are needed for the retail area and the remaining industrial/commercial area.</p>	<p>MAR18 and supporting text</p> <p>The supporting text provides no detailed up to date information as to the scale and types of use which are present in this location. It provides no indication as to opportunities which still exist within this area. The wording of the policy is insufficiently precise in a number of respects. Further information/ evidence is required to support this policy to ensure that it is up to date in respect of existing uses and planning consents.</p>

		MAR20 Query the term community properties. Need to clarify what is meant by this term.	Change from 'properties' to 'premises'	Amend text
76	Philip Smith	<p>4.14 - MAR 2</p> <p>I believe the development of the areas on Martlesham Heath as indicated in section 4.14 Figure 4.1, should not be encouraged as these areas provide a small oasis for wildlife in the centre of a built up area as well as providing a great visual green space on entering Martlesham Heath either from the A12 in a vehicle or from the retail/industrial area on foot by bicycle. These areas effectively set the initial tone on entering Martlesham Heath. In my view these areas should be included under policy MAR2 – Areas to be protected from Development.</p> <p>Policy MAR 7 – Local Gaps should give consideration to a local gap to the South of Martlesham Heath particularly considering the impact of the proposed development on the land to the south of Adastral Park. I am concerned that housing development may spill across to the west of the A12, leading to another increase in public pressure on open spaces especially the SSSI – western corridor land. I fully support the policy to maintain existing gaps to Kesgrave, Woodbridge and in the centre of the village. Please keep in mind the continuity of wildlife corridors when considering any plans.</p>	<p>Land to the south of Martlesham is outside the NP area</p>	No change
77	Jonathan Gorst		<p>Thank you very much indeed to all those who have spent considerable time and effort in the production of this draft document - it is an excellent piece of work.</p> <p>I would like to add my contribution as someone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. who has lived in Martlesham old Village since 1985 2. whose 3 children spent 6 years each at the renowned Beacon Hill school. 3. who was the only objector to speak AGAINST the Bloor Homes development at the SCDC Planning Committee. 4. as someone who regularly walks across the Common and to Woodbridge and Waldringfield and cycles along many roads in the Neighbourhood. 5. someone who has contributed to discussions with the Council over Tree Preservation Orders <p>I lived in Viking Heights for 8 years and for the last 24 years have lived at St Marys, Main Road, IP12 4SJ. This was the site where there were historical relics found in the 1950s.</p>	<p>All points raised noted and agreed</p> <p>No change</p>

		<p>As a preliminary comment, there are 2 live issues that need to be borne in mind:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the upcoming Supreme Court appeal brought by Suffolk Coastal concerning the Yoxford site. This is around the very sensitive issue of a 5 year housing supply and is being seen as a test case. 2. The proposal which is now the subject of a planning appeal for the site at the bottom of Dobbs Lane.Outside the Martlesham area but if it proceeds it will along with the 2,000 home at Adastral Park have a huge impact on traffic in the area. <p>As for comments on the specific draft policies, I would say:</p> <p>MAR2 - protected areas - there are some fabulous old woodland areas in the Neighbourhood. Trees are a most valuable local asset and planting should be encouraged.</p> <p>MAR5 - residential mix. The many houses built along Main Road over the past 20 years are nearly all 5 bedroom executive properties. There is hardly any mix. We need to have more affordable properties and properties appropriate for the elderly. So I think the Michael Howard proposal along Black Tiles Lane is positive.</p> <p>MAR6 - boats - I am not convinced this is a great issue because of the big tidal rise and fall. I think a few houseboats along Martlesham creek add to the diversity.</p> <p>MAR7 - Gaps - this is exactly the issue with the Bloors development which was contrary to the Council's Development Plan policy but was allowed to slip through on the housing supply argument. This should not be allowed to happen again as the buffer zones between Woodbridge and Kesgrave are continually being eroded.</p> <p>MAR9 - the community building in Top Street should benefit from any planning CIL monies if at all possible. Otherwise the community facilities are great and the Control; Tower is an amazing facility for young children.</p> <p>MAR10 - some more indoor facilities. Ideally some tennis courts or indoor court for say badminton. This could be provided at one of the schools.</p> <p>MAR14 - the emphasis on good links to the planned Adastral Park development. But how have Bloors managed to get away with the delays on finishing the footpaths alongside their development? They have been really</p>
--	--	---

		slow in finalising the provision.	
		<p>MAR15 - parking in the industrial area is a growing problem. If the Lidl store comes about, this will make things yet worse as the proposed parking provision is woefully inadequate and will lead to more spillage.</p> <p>MAR17 - cycling / walking - has anyone tried to walk from Black Tiles Lane to Bealings? It involves crossing the A12. There should be some other safe route. The river footpath from Martlesham creek to Waldringfield should be reinstated. The cycle lane up Red Lion Hill is inadequate. The cycle route along the Old Felixstowe Road is increasingly dangerous as Crown Point is approached.</p> <p>MAR18 -employment areas - we are most fortunate to live near to an industrial estate which is clearly thriving and so well maintained. It really is an exemplar for the type.</p> <p>MAR19 -the Sandy lane area has some growing small businesses. This should be encouraged as the area was previously a pig farm and it has limited alternative use and limited environmental benefit.</p>	<p>CEG – Adastral Park Planning Application includes plans for changes to road infrastructure.</p>
		<p>So overall some very positive comments.</p> <p>However, traffic is a real concern especially in view of the likely developments. I see the Northern by pass discussion has at last been revived but one suspects that this will be ruled out for financial reasons, The Park and Ride is at last getting better use which is good news but Suffolk County Council have failed the area by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the main roundabout with the A12. It is dangerous to get to this coming west from Main Road and every time coming eastwards from Kesgrave, cars get in the incorrect lane - it is confusing and poorly laid out. - Top Street - when the by pass went in around 1982 the County Council must have run out of funds as it is the land time forgot! Surely they could have devised a better scheme? <p>Apologies for the random nature of the comments. But thank you again for the considerable effort that has gone into this document.</p>	<p>I fully support the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan and I thank everyone who clearly worked very hard to produce this comprehensive document.</p> <p>My only comments are to endorse the need for the provision of cycle and pedestrian routes that are physically separated from vehicular traffic (policy</p>
78	Bob Reeves		<p>No change</p> <p>CEG – Adastral Park Planning</p>

		MAR14) and to emphasise that traffic generally in the village is increasing to the point where the present infrastructure will soon not be able to cope. Any further development therefore should be accompanied by suitable plans to mitigate the increase in traffic volumes.	Application includes plans for changes to road infrastructure	
79	William Barton – Barton Property Consultants	<p>Under paragraph 2.13 in order to maintain the Square as a "much valued district retail centre..." , we would ask that the Neighbourhood Plan includes a sentence/policy in support of the continued development of the Square to allow the extension of existing businesses/buildings or change of use of existing premises / land to allow new businesses/ uses - we believe this support would help maintain its "vibrance and value" for the future.</p> <p>The draft NP should be amended to include a policy on the Square which would support the extension of the existing doctors surgery which in turn would encourage other businesses and services into the Square. We believe this would help protect the viability and sustainability of the Square amid wide scale expansion of the Martlesham Heath Retail Park and Adastral Park.</p> <p>Under paragraph 2.29 the owners acknowledge the importance of the Doctors Surgery and its location at the Square. We disagree that there is "limited potential to expand" and would like the Neighbourhood Plan to recognise that there is scope to expand the existing surgery and would welcome their support in achieving this. We suggest that paragraph 6.29 and 6.30 are amended accordingly:-</p>	Comments noted and Policy MAR 3 – Development within Martlesham Heath reviewed	Policy - text amended

80	Thomas O'Brien	<p>walk, cycle or use mobility scooters.</p> <p>More A12 East West: crossings.</p> <p>Better access to NEXT and M&S when crossing the A12 footbridge. (Need to make a big detour.)</p> <p>More made up paths across the Martlesham Heath village. E.g across the Southern woods. The existing paths very muddy and impassable. A North South path exists but is not shown on the neighbourhood plan map. It links Mayfields with the cricket green.</p> <p>Improve the coastal footpath so that it links Martlesham Creek with Waldringfield. (Natural England is currently reviewing this in 2017 as part of the Coastal Access Scheme initiative.)</p>	<p>CEG – Adastral Park Planning Application includes plans for changes to road infrastructure</p> <p>Footpath map checked and revised</p> <p>Surface of paths outside scope of NP</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Map revised</p> <p>No change</p>
81	Jenny Hill – Associate Director – London Metric	<p>LondonMetric welcome the Neighbourhood Plan (NP), but request that the following amendments are made to the NP.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Proposals Map currently shows the retail parks/superstores as within the "general employment area" covered by policy MAR 18. The retail area is distinct and should be a separate designation from the employment areas. This should be identified as an "established retail area", which is suitable for retail (and other Class A) use, and would be a more accurate representation. This would still achieve the NP's presumption against the loss of existing industrial and warehousing units to retail uses within the correctly defined "general employment area". The current draft NP adopts the previous allocation within the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan that dates back to 2001. This should be updated to more accurately reflect the situation "on the ground", and the "general employment area" designation should be drawn only around the existing employment uses. The NP should state that the designated "established retail area" would be suitable for retail warehouse type development outside of the "general employment area", provided that there is no significant adverse impact on existing centres, in line with the adopted Core Strategy and NPPF guidance. 	<p>New policy added</p> <p>Noted. A separate policy has been added to address matters relating to the Retail Park.</p>	

		<p>2. The wording of policies MAR15 and MAR17 should be clarified to confirm that additional assessments and/or provision of crossing points etc. should be justified and proportional to the proposed development. Any such requirements should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; - directly related to the development; and - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. <p>This should be the starting point for the consideration of any proposal. It should also be noted that the vehicle parking standards contained within the Suffolk Advisory Parking Guidance are maximum standards for all Class A uses, and the NP policy should not seek to impose a higher level of parking requirement.</p>	<p>This is a fundamental principle of planning so is unnecessary to reiterate in a policy</p>	No change
82	Mr & Mrs Goddard	<p>We have read this plan and confirm that the draft NP should be presented for examination at the end of the consultation period.</p> <p>Clearly a lot of hard work has gone into this document and hopefully residents will have given the plan the consideration it deserved.</p>	Noted	No change
83	A.D. Ward	<p>Do we really need any more houses being built in Martlesham ? What with Adastral Park [2000 +], Mill Heath [250] plus the latest development below Blacktiles school as well as any "in fill" surely enough is enough. I have lived in the locality for 60 + years and have seen vast changes, not only in the amount of houses being built, but also in the volume of traffic on our roads. Even before the bypass was built, the amount of traffic necessitated the introduction of traffic lights at the Red Lion junction with the A12. At certain times, even with the bypass it is now getting to the stage where you need traffic lights to help you gain access. The roads are bad enough now before the extra Adastral Park traffic. 2,000 houses must equate to 4, 5, 6 thousand extra cars on our roads which frankly we could well do without. I'm afraid that the amount of building taking place in Martlesham is making it a less attractive place to want to live. What used to be a nice little village is now fast becoming a suburb of Ipswich.</p>	Noted	No change
84	Mr s B. Riddell	Document was well put together. Thank you very much for time invested.	Noted	No change
85	Mr C. Riddell	I feel really grateful to those who have spent so much time putting the documentation together.	Noted	No change

86	Mercer	More infrastructure New primary (secondary school) Better co-ordination between all the authorities to provide a "joined up" solution.	Larger doctor's surgery	See CEG Planning Application proposals for Adastral Park and Policy MAR 3
87	Robertson	Congratulations on all the hard work that has been done in producing a comprehensive summary of parishioner's views. It is easy to read and well presented. I think it would be helpful to make it clearer why non-policy actions are listed as such. E.g. They describe a current situation which will not attract funding from new developments; the policies are set to produce a framework for future development.	Noted	9. Non Policy Actions – text revised. Column removed from table.
88	Irwin	Table 9.1. The acronyms under "ownership" have not been explained elsewhere. They largely relate to the Council, its committees – I think it gives a false impression that the Parish Council is largely responsible for these issues and can resolve them if it wants. I suggest this column is taken out or clarified. Can Policy MAR 7 – Local gaps to be strengthened with reference to preserving the AONB, SSSI, RAMSAR etc? Well Done!	Noted	These areas are covered by statutory protection. No change

89	Davey	What is point of NP if items 1/3/8/10 are outside scope?	Noted	No change
90	Mr T Robertson	<p>I think it is necessary to make it clearer to the Martlesham parishioners the advantages of having a Neighbourhood Plan in place. There is a danger that because it cannot include many items which people would like to preserve, improve etc., those people might vote against the plan.</p> <p>Another way of putting this is to clarify the disadvantages of having no Neighbourhood Plan. This could be seen as negative campaigning, however.</p>	Noted	Text 1.2 – 1.5 amended
91	Mr Steven King – Historic Places Advisor Historic England	<p>Ref: Consultation on Pre Submission Draft Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail of 11 October inviting Historic England to comment on the Pre Submission draft of your Neighbourhood Plan. I have now had an opportunity to review the draft document and our advice is set out below.</p> <p>Historic England is primarily concerned with how your Plan will impact on the historic environment and our advice focuses on those aspects of your Plan.</p> <p>Historic England is pleased to note that the preamble and vision both celebrate the heritage of Martlesham. We would recommend that the Heritage policies from Suffolk Coastal Core Strategy are listed alongside other policies from the strategy in Policy Justification, which forms part of Section 4, Approach to Development.</p> <p>Section 6.22 to Section 6.28 covers non designated heritage assets and incorporates Policy MAR13: Non Designated Heritage Assets. Historic England welcomes the inclusion of this section and policy but would advise that the title to section 6.22 is amended to read <i>Designated and non-designated heritage assets</i>. It would also be useful to plot both designated and non-designated heritage assets on a map which could be read in conjunction with this section and Policy MAR13. This would provide good baseline information stating the designated heritage assets but also noting the importance of non-designated assets which make an important contribution to the local distinctiveness of the area and locally important archaeology. You may wish to caveat this section to allow for new entries if further interesting historic buildings, structures or remains are found.</p> <p>Policy MAR13: Non-designated Heritage Assets should also be amended to</p>	<p>This has been revised to only relate to non-designated heritage assets. It is not considered necessary to plot them all.</p>	The policy has been amended

		<p>read Designated and Non- designated Heritage Assets. The policy itself would also be stronger if it sought to protect the significance (including the fabric and the setting) of designated and non-designated assets in addition to preventing their loss. This will assist in ensuring that both designated and non-designated heritage assets can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure it is in line with national planning policy.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Policy amended</p>	
		<p>Sluice Farmhouse, a grade II listed building is located immediately adjacent to the area covered by Policy MAR19 Sandy Lane. The significance of this building is contributed to by its setting. Policy MAR 19 would be strengthened by reference to this and ensure that its setting is protected.</p> <p>Historic England welcomes Policy MAR2: Areas to be Protected from Development and Policy MAR3: Development within Martlesham Heath. Martlesham Heath is an interesting development and a heritage asset in its own right. The neighbourhood plan rightly celebrates its development. Likewise Policy MAR4: Residential Design and Amenity is also to be welcomed.</p> <p>Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Team as part of its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice on later stages of the Neighbourhood Plan process and potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise in the Neighbourhood Plan where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.</p>	<p>If you have any questions with regards to the comments made then please do get back to me. In the meantime we look forward to continuing to work with you and your colleagues.</p>	<p>All points raised noted.</p> <p>Amendments made</p>
92	Susan Robertson Parish Clerk - Martlesham	<p>Pge 9 2.9 See also background to vision statement. Appendix 3 –should read Chapter 3?</p> <p>Pge 12 2.17 with the BT complex, should read within?</p> <p>Pge 13 2.21 Should the Recreation Ground be included?</p> <p>Pge 13 Footnote Indicate where to find the Proposals Map</p>		157

	<p>Pge 17 2.31 Do most young people use Martlesham swimming facilities, e.g. Leisure Centre & Rams Rest? You probably found this though the consultation but I was surprised.</p> <p>Pge 23 4.1 Principally in an around – should read and?</p> <p>Pge 24 Policy MAR 1 – refer to 10 Proposals Map to clarify.</p> <p>Pge 38 First paragraph in different and small font.</p> <p>Pge 40 5.14 Figure 2.1 – direct to page 7 so easy to reference?</p> <p>Pge 59 7.19 Last sentence – clarify what sort of new development. I was not sure whether you meant to refer to the Gladman development as that is what springs to mind rather than business.</p> <p>Pge 60 7.21 Last bullet – safe points.</p> <p>Pge 62 7.22 car-bourne – carborne</p> <p>Pge 68 8.3 6th paragraph: Those who companies – delete who.</p> <p>Table 9.1 Ownership needs clarification – implication the Martlesham Parish Council can sort out these things</p>
--	--