

Consultation Statement

WLP2.14 Land North of Union Lane, Oulton
Residential Development Brief
Supplementary Planning Document

September 2021



Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Initial Consultation	3
3. Consultation on Draft Residential Development Brief.....	5
Appendix 1 – Initial Consultation.....	7
Appendix 2 – Consultation Bodies	20
Appendix 3 – Site Notice and Twitter Post.....	21
Appendix 4 – Responses to draft residential development brief for WLP2.14 Land North of Union Lane, Oulton	23

1. Introduction

Residential Development Briefs are being produced for a number of allocations within both East Suffolk Local Plans. The residential development briefs highlight the considerations that any development on the relevant site will need to respond to. The briefs outline the Council's aims for each site without being prescriptive, and allow for innovative design. The residential development briefs will be considerations when a planning application is submitted for a site and planning applications will be expected to demonstrate how the principles outlined in the relevant residential development brief have been considered.

The first development brief to be produced is for Land North of Union Lane (Policy WLP2.14 of the East Suffolk – Waveney Local Plan). This Consultation Statement provides a record of all consultation carried out as part of the development of the brief, and has been produced under Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

Consultation on the brief has been carried out in two stages:

- Consultation on Residential Development Brief Template took place between 5th June and 24th July 2020.
- Consultation the draft residential development brief for Land North of Union Lane (Policy WLP2.14) took place between 10th May and 21st June 2021.

The statement outlines both the initial consultation on the template and the later consultation on the draft residential development brief for WLP2.14 Land North of Union Lane.

The Council's approach to engagement is set out in the Statement of Community Involvement¹. While preparing the template and the brief, East Suffolk Council consulted with relevant organisations and members of the public. Details of this consultation process are set out below.

2. Initial Consultation

Who was consulted?

The following organisations and groups were consulted during the initial consultation:

¹ [Statement of Community Involvement \(April 2021\)](#)

- Individuals registered on the Local Plan and Related Documents Mailing List.
- Individuals and organisations registered on the Developers Forum Mailing List.
- Registered Landowners and Agents for allocated sites in the East Suffolk Council – Waveney Local Plan and East Suffolk Council – Suffolk Coastal Local Plan.
- Members of the public

How were they contacted?

A seven-week consultation on the residential development briefs template took place between 5th June and 24th July 2020. The consultation was advertised using targeted emails and social media posts. Those on the Council's Local Plan and Related Documents Mailing List and the Developers Forum were contacted directly by email or letter.

Comments could be made on the document directly through the Council's website. Comments were also accepted via email and letter.

To focus the responses, the consultation asked the following questions:

- 1) Do you think residential development briefs will help facilitate high quality design?
 - a. If yes, why do you think this?
 - b. If no, why do you think this and what other design governance tool/s do you think would be more useful?
- 2) Do you think the draft residential development brief template provides the scope and detail needed to guide Pre-Application discussions and planning applications on allocated sites?
- 3) Are there any additional considerations that the draft residential development brief template could include?
- 4) Do you think the draft residential development brief template is easy to use and understand?
- 5) Do you think the balance between written and visual information is appropriate?
- 6) How do you think the document presentation could be improved?
- 7) Do you have views on when and how landowners and agents should be involved in the drafting process?

The consultation documents were made available on the East Suffolk Council website via the pages below:

[Residential Development Briefs Draft Template - East Suffolk Council, Strategic Planning Consultations \(inconsult.uk\)](#)

Due to the social distancing restrictions and the national lockdown as the result of the Covid-19 pandemic, libraries and other public spaces were not accessible during the consultation period. Therefore, paper copies of documents could not be made available at these locations. Physical copies of documents were, however, sent out on request.

In total 15 individuals and organisations responded to the consultation. Between them they made 55 comments.

A summary of the comments received, and the Council's response to those comments are set out in Appendix 1 of this statement. Full copies of the responses have been published on the Council's website at:

[Responses to the Consultation - Residential Development Briefs Draft Template - East Suffolk Council, Strategic Planning Consultations \(inconsult.uk\)](#)

3. Consultation on Draft Residential Development Brief

Who was consulted?

The following organisations and groups were consulted during the consultation:

- Internal colleagues and teams, including Development Management.
- Individuals registered on the Local Plan and Related Documents Mailing List.
- The landowner of the site
- Oulton Parish Council
- Suffolk County Council
- Members of the public

How were they contacted?

During the preparation of the draft residential development brief for WLP2.14 Land North of Union Lane, the Council engaged with the landowner (including their agents), Suffolk County Council and Oulton Parish Council. Each provided comments that were incorporated into the residential development brief where appropriate. During the preparation of the residential development brief a wide range of service areas were also involved, including Planning Policy, Development Management, Major Sites and Infrastructure, Design and Conservation, Landscape, and Ecology.

A six-week consultation on the draft residential development brief took place between 10th May and 23rd June 2021. The consultation was initially scheduled to end on the 21st June. However, a technical issue on the 21st June meant that comments could not be submitted on that day, therefore the consultation was extended to the 23rd June to mitigate this.

The consultation was advertised using site notices, social media posts and a press release. Those on the Council's Local Plan and Related Documents Mailing List were contacted directly by email or letter. Individual emails were also sent to the landowner (and their agents) and Oulton Parish Council.

The residential development brief was presented primarily through the use of ArcGIS Storymap. The Storymap was made available through the link below:

[Land north of Union Lane, Oulton \(arcgis.com\)](#)

Comments could be made on each section of the residential development brief through links that took participants to Inovem questionnaires. Participants were able to use tick-boxes to highlight which paragraphs or maps their comments related to, or if their comments were general.

Comments were also accepted via email and letter.

The draft residential development brief was also available to view as a PDF. The supporting documents (Initial Consultation Statement, Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Opinion, Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion and Equality Impact Assessment Screening Opinion) were also available as PDF documents.

A summary of the comments received, and the Council's response, are set out in Appendix 4 of this statement.

Due to the social distancing restrictions and the national lockdown as the result of the Covid-19 pandemic, libraries and other public spaces were not accessible during the consultation period. Therefore, paper copies of documents could not be made available at these locations. Physical copies of documents were, however, sent out on request.

In total 67 individuals and organisations responded to the consultation. Between them they made 114 comments.

Full copies of the responses have been published on the Council's website at

[Responses to The Consultation - WLP2.14 Draft Residential Development Brief - East Suffolk Council, Strategic Planning Consultations \(inconsult.uk\)](#)

Appendix 1 – Initial Consultation

The table below lists the main issues raised in the consultation responses, the Council’s response and how they informed the preparation of the document.

Respondent	Key Issues/Comments	East Suffolk Council Response	Action
Suffolk County Council Public Rights of Way	Footpaths is a legally defined term. Under Movement of Development Considerations change ‘footpaths’ to ‘footways’ and ‘Rights of Way’ to ‘public access to the site’.	Agreed.	Changes made.
Suffolk County Council Public Rights of Way	Under Creating a Built Form replace ‘footpaths’ with ‘public rights of way’	Agreed.	Change made.
Suffolk County Council Public Rights of Way	Under Streets and Movement change ‘footpaths’ to ‘public access’.	Agreed.	Change made.
Suffolk County Council Public Rights of Way	On the Development Framework Map change ‘footpaths’ to ‘footways and public rights of way’.	Agreed.	Change made.
Suffolk County Council Public Rights of Way	The Template provides specific direction for sites and provides sufficient scope and detail for pre-application discussions.	Comments noted.	None.
Suffolk County Council Public Rights of Way	The Template could go further to prioritise car-free and accessible journeys to services and facilities, community and accessing the wider countryside.	Agreed.	The Movement and Streets and Movement sections will be rearranged to detail sustainable transport options before car access to show that these have a higher

			priority. This sentiment is also highlighted in Local Plan policies.
Suffolk County Council Public Rights of Way	Illustrate best practice with real examples and local case studies to illustrate objectives and aims.	Comments noted. Examples will be considered on a case by case basis and used where they can clearly show the aims and ambitions that the Council has for a site.	None.
Environment Agency	Under Natural and Historic Environment section there needs to be clear guidance on where a flood risk assessment is needed.	Comments noted. Local Plan policies identify when a flood risk assessment will be needed for a site. This will be reflected in the Residential Development Briefs.	None.
Environment Agency	Under Natural and Historic Environment land contamination should also be identified.	Agreed.	Land contamination has been added to the Natural and Historic Environment section.
Environment Agency	Green corridors should be listed in the Streets and Movement section as well as the Landscape Integration section of the Development Framework.	Agreed.	The Streets and Movement section now refers to considering how green corridors could be integrated into the pedestrian network.
Environment Agency	The Landscape Integration section should also promote Biodiversity Net Gain.	Agreed.	Reference to the need to provide Biodiversity Net Gain has been added to the Landscape Integration section and will be considered as appropriate to the scale of the individual sites.
Wellington Ltd.	The document helps provide detailed requirements and opportunities for positive decision making.	Comments noted.	None.
Wellington Ltd.	Key considerations should include site contamination and drainage. Input	Comments noted and agreed.	Land contamination and drainage has been added to the Natural and Historic Environment section.

	from other departments would be helpful.		Contacts have been established with key stakeholders who can provide information on these issues for specific sites.
Nigel Doyle	There are alternative methods that would secure better places on allocated sites, such as Garden City Principles, Enquiry by Design, Parameter Plans and some of the suggestions from the Building Beautiful Places Report.	The Council will reflect the best practice available when creating the Residential Development Briefs. Where relevant, other studies and information will be included within the Briefs to ensure that the best and most up-to-date information is included and considered throughout the planning application process.	None.
Nigel Doyle	The Template would allow for past mistakes to be repeated, does not allow for community engagement and could allow mediocre schemes to be approved or innovative schemes to be dismissed.	The Residential Development Briefs Draft Template has been created to provide clarity on sites to ensure the best possible development whilst also not being prescriptive to allow for innovative design. Support for innovative design has also been included in Local Plan policies which planning applications will still be subject to. The Residential Development Briefs for individual sites will also be subject to public consultation before adoption.	None.
Nigel Doyle	Not clear how the document will promote Building for Life 12, sustainable construction, digital infrastructure and allotments.	These elements are covered by Local Plan policies which any planning application will be subject to. The Residential Development Briefs will help	None.

		show how these policy requirements can be delivered on specific sites.	
Nigel Doyle	No mention of Biodiversity Net Gain and biodiversity should be considered under following headings: distinctiveness, condition, strategic significance and habitat connectivity.	Comments noted and agreed.	Reference to the need to provide Biodiversity Net Gain has been added to the Landscape Integration section and will be considered as appropriate to the scale of the individual sites.
Nigel Doyle	The Template does not have any requirements for renewable energy, sustainable urban drainage systems and grey water harvesting, a clear definition of public and open spaces, a diversity of housing types and tenures, any long term management, communal recycling facilities and facilities for delivery drivers.	These elements are covered by Local Plan policies which any planning application will be subject to. The Residential Development Briefs will help show how these policy requirements can be delivered on specific sites.	None.
Historic England	Not clear how the Residential Development Briefs will fit into the development process. Need to be clear on who will commission the Briefs, the stakeholders who will be involved, the timescales involved, the extent of consultation and the adoption process. A paragraph outlining these issues is recommended.	Comments noted. The Council will lead the creation of the Residential Development Briefs and will involve key stakeholders dependent on the issues related to each site. The timescales for each Brief will be dependent on a number of factors and cannot be confirmed. Each Brief will be subject to the same period of consultation and adoption process of other Supplementary Planning Documents. A paragraph outlining this process is not considered to be necessary.	None. The process that will occur following the public consultation on site specific Residential Development Briefs will be clearly outlined during the public consultation stage.

Historic England	Natural Environment and Historic Environment could have their own sections.	Natural and Historic Environment features will be given their own maps and pages if there is sufficient information to require it.	None.
Historic England	The Residential Development Briefs state that they replace the need for an Outline application. This is the stage where some key technical evidence is produced, such as archaeological surveys. Without this stage it is not clear when these will be produced. This evidence should precede the creation of the Briefs, or at an early stage as possible.	The Outline stage does provide an opportunity for key studies to be completed, however these can also be completed at later stages. Also, the Residential Development Briefs will provide a high level indicative plan that will be adaptable and allow for different and innovative designs, meaning it will also be able to accommodate any issues that arise throughout the application process.	The paragraph referring to Outline applications has been reworded to state that the Residential Development Briefs can allow applications for the relevant site to proceed straight to Full application.
Historic England	The Briefs should contain the most up-to-date evidence, including Historic Environment Records.	Agreed. The Council will always use the most up-to-date evidence available.	None.
Broads Authority	Overall, as very positive approach and should ensure sound urban design principles are adopted for each site, with local context being well considered.	Comments noted.	None.
Broads Authority	Where relevant, there needs to be consideration of the impact on the Broads and their setting. For sites near to the Broads, there should be consideration of the Broads Landscape Character Appraisal, Water Quality Risk Maps and SSSI Risk Maps.	Agreed.	Reference to the impact on the Broads and the referenced studies has been included in the Natural and Historic Environment section and will be included where relevant.

Broads Authority	Development Framework Map could be considered as a preferred design approach, rather than an indicative design showing key considerations, but this can be overcome.	Comments noted. The Development Framework Map will highlight key considerations, however it will be made clear that this is only indicative.	None.
Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council	The Residential Development Briefs should require provision for adequate parking and service vehicle access, access to catchment school, reducing social isolation and loneliness, environmental care and sustainable transport, helping people age well and traffic and road safety.	These elements are covered by Local Plan policies which any planning application will be subject to. The Residential Development Briefs will help show how these policy requirements can be delivered on specific sites.	None.
Grundisburgh and Culpho Parish Council	There are alternative methods that would secure better places on allocated sites, such as Garden City Principles, Enquiry by Design, Parameter Plans and some of the suggestions from the Building Beautiful Places Report.	The Council will reflect the best practice available when creating the Residential Development Briefs. Where relevant, other studies and information will be included within the Briefs to ensure that the best and most up-to-date information is included and considered throughout the planning application process.	None.
Grundisburgh and Culpho Parish Council	The Template would allow for past mistakes to be repeated, does not allow for community engagement and could allow mediocre schemes to be approved or innovative schemes to be dismissed.	The Residential Development Briefs Draft Template has been created to provide clarity on sites to ensure the best possible development whilst also not being prescriptive to allow for innovative design. Support for innovative design has also been included in Local Plan policies which planning applications will still be	None.

		subject to. The Residential Development Briefs for individual sites will also be subject to public consultation before adoption.	
Grundisburgh and Culpho Parish Council	Not clear how the document will promote Building for Life 12, sustainable construction, digital infrastructure and allotments.	These elements are covered by Local Plan policies which any planning application will be subject to. The Residential Development Briefs will help show how these policy requirements can be delivered on specific sites.	None.
Grundisburgh and Culpho Parish Council	No mention of Biodiversity Net Gain and biodiversity should be considered under following headings: distinctiveness, condition, strategic significance and habitat connectivity.	Comments noted and agreed.	Reference to the need to provide Biodiversity Net Gain has been added to the Landscape Integration section and will be considered as appropriate to the scale of the individual sites.
Grundisburgh and Culpho Parish Council	The Template does not have any requirements for renewable energy, sustainable urban drainage systems and grey water harvesting, a clear definition of public and open spaces, a diversity of housing types and tenures, any long term management, communal recycling facilities and facilities for delivery drivers.	These issues are either already covered by Local Plan policies or are additional requirements that would not be appropriate for inclusion within the Residential Development Briefs.	None.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Under Natural and Historic Environment section should include requirement for consideration of key ecological networks.	Comments noted. The Council does not have sufficient data on ecological networks across the District at present to include this as a consideration. Site specific information will be included from studies where relevant. If	None.

		information on ecological networks does become available during the creation of the Residential Development Briefs this will be included.	
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Landscape Integration should include a requirement for measurable Biodiversity Net Gain.	Comments noted and agreed.	Reference to the need to provide Biodiversity Net Gain has been added to the Landscape Integration section and will be considered as appropriate to the scale of the individual sites.
Westerfield Parish Council	Local Parish Councils should have the opportunity to contribute from an early stage.	Parish and Town Councils will have the opportunity to contribute to the Residential Development Briefs along with the local community.	None.
Suffolk County Council	Concern over the removal of the need for an Outline application due to this stage being associated with specific site evaluations. Need to identify what site assessments are needed as these could have knock-on effects on the layout.	The Outline stage does provide an opportunity for key studies to be completed, however these can also be completed at later stages. Also, the Residential Development Briefs will provide a high level indicative plan that will be adaptable and allow for different and innovative designs, meaning it will also be able to accommodate any issues that arise throughout the application process.	The paragraph referring to Outline applications has been reworded to state that the Residential Development Briefs can allow applications for the relevant site to proceed straight to Full application.
Suffolk County Council	There is no reference to climate change. There are a number of relevant considerations including water stress, coastal management, reducing carbon emissions etc.	Issues relating to climate change have been addressed in Local Plan policies which any planning application will still be subject to. Where relevant, site specific issues related to climate change will be referenced.	None.

Suffolk County Council	It would be useful for the Residential Development Briefs to reference how development could enhance public health and provided basic information on the health and wellbeing of existing communities. Many of the topics are addressed in Local Plan policies and these should be reflected.	The Residential Development Briefs will make reference to relevant Local Plan policies and highlight when these should be considered. Other public health benefits such as green infrastructure will also be considered through the creation of the residential Development Briefs. Contacts have also been established with the Suffolk County Council Public Health department who will be able to comment on individual sites.	Considerations that could improve public health, such as promoting walking and cycling, have been reorganised to be placed above other considerations. Other features such as green infrastructure will also be considered for their public health benefits.
Suffolk County Council	Welcome reference to Historic Environment Records and archaeological potential.	Comments noted.	None.
Suffolk County Council	There needs to be a more holistic consideration of water, not just flooding. Watercourses and ditches could be mapped and flooding from all sources should be highlighted. Ensuring space for water should be given greater emphasis in the Development Framework section. Suffolk County Council supports multifunctional SuDS but their long-term maintenance needs to be considered.	Comments noted. Features such as ditches will be identified at the site visit stage of creating the Residential Development Briefs. They will also be identified on relevant maps within the Briefs. Contacts have been established with key stakeholders who will be able to comment on drainage and other water issues to ensure these are fully integrated into the Briefs.	None.
Suffolk County Council	Priority should be given to sustainable transport modes.	Agreed. Local Plan policies also highlight the importance of these modes and will be referenced within the Residential Development Briefs.	The Movement and Streets and Movement sections will be rearranged to detail sustainable transport options before car access to

			show that these have a higher priority. This sentiment is also highlighted in Local Plan policies.
Suffolk County Council	It should be highlighted when a site is within the Minerals Consultation Area or within 250m of a facility safeguarded by the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.	Agreed.	These considerations have been added to the Natural and Historic Environment section.
Suffolk County Council	Natural and Historic Environment section could be separated.	Natural and Historic Environment features will be given their own maps and pages if there is sufficient information to require it.	None.
Suffolk County Council	Suffolk County Council and other statutory consultees should be involved from an early stage.	Agreed. Suffolk County Council and other stakeholders will be involved during the creation of the Residential Development Briefs where this is considered necessary.	None.
Persimmon	The Residential Development Briefs are a way of providing certainty and are easy to use. They will inform the approach to layouts and highlight the Councils ambitions.	Comments noted.	None.
Persimmon	Who will be responsible for creating the brief? What are the timescales? How will sites be prioritised? Is there a particular view on contemporary design?	The Council will lead the creation of the Residential Development Briefs and will involve key stakeholders dependent on the issues related to each site. The timescales and priority of each Brief will be dependent on a number of factors and cannot be confirmed at this time. Each Brief will be subject to the same	None.

		period of consultation and adoption process of other Supplementary Planning Documents. The design of schemes will be considered on a case by case basis, however the Residential Development Briefs have been designed to ensure innovative design is not inhibited.	
Persimmon	What would the Councils position be if an application was submitted?	The Residential Development Briefs are intended to help focus the pre-application process. The Council will encourage landowners, agents and developers to work with us to develop Briefs for sites in order to provide certainty and clarity in the planning application process.	None.
Persimmon	Landowners should be involved early in the process. Expectations should be realistic, and the Residential Development Briefs should not be prescriptive.	Landowners and agents will be involved during the drafting of the Residential Development Briefs. The Briefs have been designed to ensure that they are not prescriptive and still allow for innovative and good design.	None.
Pigeon Investment Management	Will Residential Development Briefs be required for sites that require masterplans to be developed?	Some sites allocated in the Local Plans are at a scale where they will require masterplans to be agreed before an application can be approved. This is stated in the relevant Local Plan policies. Residential Development Briefs will not be created for these sites due to the requirement for a masterplan.	None.

<p>Pigeon Investment Management</p>	<p>Will Residential Development Briefs be created for sites where planning applications are being submitted at the time?</p>	<p>The Residential Development Briefs are intended to help focus the pre-application process. If a planning application has advanced before a Brief can be created, the creation of a Brief would likely slow down the planning process. A Brief would therefore not be created.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Pigeon Investment Management</p>	<p>Residential Development Briefs should not be created for sites of more than 200 dwellings.</p>	<p>The Council will consider the need for Residential Development Briefs on a site by site basis. There will be no strict threshold on the size of the sites that will be considered, however any site that specifies a masterplan is required for a planning application within the Local Plan will not have a Brief created for them.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Pigeon Investment Management</p>	<p>A full list of sites and timetables should be released.</p>	<p>The priority given to sites to create a Residential Development Brief is dependent on a number of factors and is likely to change over time. A full list of sites will not be released in order to provide flexibility and allow the Council to respond to the circumstances at the time. However landowners, developers and agents will be contacted at the beginning of the creation process for Briefs associated with their sites so they can be involved in the creation process.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG	Sites of more than 250 dwellings should be supported by a Health Impact Assessment.	Comments noted.	None.
Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG	The Council should consult with key stakeholders and infrastructure providers from an early stage.	The Council will consult with key stakeholder relevant to the location and scale of the site as early as possible during the drafting process.	None.
Peasenhall Parish Council	Approve of the creation of Residential Development Briefs and encourage participation by the community during their development.	The local community will have the opportunity to contribute to the Residential Development Briefs through public consultation.	None.
Peasenhall Parish Council	Recommends the inclusion of a carbon neutral policy.	Issues relating to climate change have been addressed in Local Plan policies which any planning application will still be subject to. Where relevant, site specific issues related to climate change will be referenced.	None.

Appendix 2 – Consultation Bodies

Specific consultation bodies

The Coal Authority
Environment Agency
Historic England
Marine Management Organisation
Natural England
Network Rail
Highways Agency
Suffolk County Council
Parish and Town Councils within and adjoining the East Suffolk District
Suffolk Constabulary
Adjoining local planning authorities – Ipswich Borough Council, Babergh District Council, Mid Suffolk District Council, South Norfolk District Council, Great Yarmouth Borough Council and the Broads Authority
NHS England and the Care Commissioning Groups
Anglian Water
Essex and Suffolk Water
Homes England
Electronic communication companies who own or control apparatus in the District
Relevant gas and electricity companies

General consultation bodies

Voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the District
Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the District
Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the District
Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the District
Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the District

Other individuals and organisations

Includes local businesses, high schools, individuals, local organisations and groups, planning agents, developers, landowners, residents and others on the Local Plan mailing list.

Appendix 3 – Site Notice and Twitter Post



EASTSUFFOLK COUNCIL

Consultation period
10 May to 21 June 2021

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT BRIEF

LAND NORTH OF UNION LANE, OULTON

What are we doing?

Land north of Union Lane, Oulton (WLP2.14) was allocated for approximately 150 homes in the Waveney Local Plan in 2019. East Suffolk Council is now preparing a residential development brief for the site to create a high quality development. This is not a planning application, but will help guide development on the site before any planning application is submitted.

How can you get involved?

- HIGHLIGHT ISSUES**
What issues should be considered when setting out the site layout?
- SUGGEST SOLUTIONS**
What design solutions would you suggest to address any issues on the site?
- INTERACTIVE DOCUMENT**
View the draft residential development brief online and give your views.

Find out more and give your views:
[www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/
planning-policy-consultations](http://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations)

Alternatively, please send your comments to:
East Suffolk Council, Planning Policy & Delivery Team, Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk NR33 0EQ

📧 planningpolicy@eastsuffolk.gov.uk
☎ 01394 444557 / 01502 523029

← **Tweet**

↻ East Suffolk Council Planning Retweeted



East Suffolk Council ✓
@EastSuffolk



Have your say! Residential development briefs are being prepared for a number of sites allocated in the East Suffolk Local Plans. The first of these is for WLP2.14 (Land north of Union Lane, Oulton) - a 6 week public consultation begins today:
[eastsuffolk.gov.uk/news/have-your...](https://eastsuffolk.gov.uk/news/have-your-...)



11:23 AM · May 10, 2021 · Twitter Web App

3 Retweets 4 Likes



Appendix 4 – Responses to draft residential development brief for WLP2.14 Land North of Union Lane, Oulton

Name/ Organisation	Section of Development Brief	Type of response	Comment Summary	Council Response	Action
Peter Cannings	Introduction – paragraph 1.7	Observation	Agree with scheme in principle however concerns over increased traffic. Already severe congestion on Beccles Road/Bridge Road especially at peak times. Bridge Road/ Normanston Drive/Gorleston Road junction severely under threat as well. Current additional crossing will have little impact on traffic from Beccles Road direction. 150 new homes will add roughly 300 vehicles. Need a western relief road to alleviate congestion.	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council have also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.	None.

Scott Miles	Introduction – general comment	Observation	Confused about amount of publicity as I live on the edge of the site and on the planning list but have not received an email or letter.	The consultation for the residential development brief followed the processes outlined in the East Suffolk Statement of Community Involvement as closely as possible without breaking the national restrictions put in place due to the Covid-19 pandemic. This included sending emails to everyone listed on the Local Plan and related documents mailing list and publicising on social media. If you did not receive an email or letter, it is recommended that you check that your details are up to date on our system by emailing planningpolicy@eastssuffolk.gov.uk .	None.
Norman Castleton	Introduction – paragraphs 1.1 – 1.10	Objection	Do not agree with any of this as 150 homes cannot be supported by services in the area, such as health services, employment, green energy, water or environment.	The Council has worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan which includes the site WLP2.14 Land North of Union Lane, as well as during the creation of the residential development brief. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires Any	None.

				needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the Local Plan and the Residential Development Brief.	
Mark Harwood	Introduction	Objection	Shocked and saddened that it is considered acceptable to ruin this area. Will have direct impact on lives. Can't even empty bins but want to build more houses. Didn't work all my life to buy a house and have building site next door.	The principle of development on this site was established through the creation of the Local Plan, which is supported by an extensive evidence base and was subject to multiple periods of public consultation, as well as a public examination.	None.
Brian Sutton	Introduction – general comment	Observation	I am very worried about main road access to the B1375. With 130 houses there will be a lot of traffic.	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council have also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief, and their comments have been incorporated into the brief. Once a	None.

				<p>detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.</p>	
<p>Norman Castleton</p>	<p>Introduction paragraphs 1.1 – 1.10</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>What about environmental assessment, health provision assessment, clean air scheme, wildlife preservation, green energy assessment, water provision scheme and discouragement of private cars with added public transport. Specific greening criteria for tree planting of 2000 trees minimum, as well as houses for local people and no landlords.</p>	<p>As stated in policy WLP2.14, any planning application will need to be supported by a contamination assessment, ecological assessment, transport assessment and travel plan. Any planning application will also need to provide relevant supporting documents as outlined in the East Suffolk Local Validation List. Any planning application will also need to meet the criteria of the planning policies listed on page 5, which includes policies covering housing mix and tenure, biodiversity and sustainable construction.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p>Carol Wyatt</p>	<p>Introduction – general comment</p>	<p>Objection</p>	<p>Village has already been built up in recent years and this would put horrendous pressure on existing services including doctors, sewers and roads. Oulton Road North is used as a rat run and the B1375 is already dangerous. Site will destroy even more wildlife and habitats which has to stop. What about the old burial ground? We have to live with decisions and should not be about the money.</p>	<p>The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief, which includes the potential need for a pre-school. The local Clinical Commissioning Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site.</p> <p>The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways'</p>	<p>None.</p>
--------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------	---	--	--------------

				<p>authority in the creation of this residential development brief, who have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.</p> <p>The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered and incorporated into any future proposals.</p> <p>The development framework within the residential development brief highlights a number of considerations that will protect wildlife and habitats and integrate them into the development, such as retaining existing trees and hedgerows and the incorporation</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>of a green corridor. As stated in Policy WLP2.14 any planning application for this site will need to be supported by an ecological assessment to determine the existing ecological value of the site. Also, as stated on page 5, any planning application will need to meet the criteria set out in policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity.</p>	
<p>Karan Anderton</p>	<p>Introduction</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>Concerns for residents of Oulton Road North. During construction and after road will be used as a rat run. Already dangerous due to residents using it to turn, with a new gate being put up to stop this. Always cars parked along the road which could be dangerous especially for children.</p>	<p>The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further</p>	<p>None.</p>

				<p>consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.</p> <p>Conditions relating to the safe construction of the site will be established at the planning application stage.</p>	
Ian Vince	Introduction – general comment and paragraphs 1.1 – 1.10	Observation	<p>Introduction is basic and site was not identified on land registry search in 2020 when buying home. Will need to consider removal of remains at burial ground, flood risk issues already present since Parkhill was built, CO2, light, noise and pollution impacts, revenue to Council and expenditure taken from proposal, wildlife impacts and tree preservation, financial study and impact on homes close to borders. Covid has been used as a blanket to get some developments approved.</p>	<p>The site is allocated as part of the East Suffolk Waveney local Plan, which was adopted in 2019 and subject to several rounds of public consultation and a public examination.</p> <p>As stated in Policy WLP2.14, any planning application will need to be supported by a contamination assessment, ecological assessment, transport assessment and travel plan, as well as all relevant supporting documents as outlined in the East Suffolk Local Validation List. Any planning application will also need to meet the criteria of the planning policies listed on page 5, which includes policies covering housing mix and tenure,</p>	None.

				<p>biodiversity and sustainable construction.</p> <p>The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered an incorporated into any future proposals.</p> <p>The impact on the value of existing properties is not a material consideration as defined by national law when considering a planning application.</p>	
Jill Appleton	Introduction – general comment	Objection	Proposed development would increase traffic on B1375, which has many old buildings and no infrastructure to assist with increase in traffic. New development would spoil the village. Surprised to see Parish Councils of Peasenhall, Grundisburgh and Westerfield have been included in consultation, but no one has contacted Oulton Parish Council.	<p>The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network, including the B1375. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against. Suffolk County Council as the local highways’ authority have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into</p>	

				<p>the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.</p> <p>The principle of development on this site was established through the creation of the Local Plan, which is supported by an extensive evidence base and was subject to multiple periods of public consultation, as well as a public examination.</p> <p>The comments and responses, including those of the various Parish Councils, included in the Initial Consultation Statement were responses that were received during the consultation on the draft template for the residential development briefs which took place in spring 2020. The comments do not relate to the residential development brief for WLP2.14.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

<p>Joyce Hicks</p>	<p>Introduction – general comment and paragraphs 1.1 – 1.10</p>	<p>Objection</p>	<p>Concerned with increase in traffic and strain on local services. On Somerleyton Road traffic has increased significantly since moved there, already have to wait for considerable amount of time to back car out of drive. Since supermarket has been built traffic has got worse, even though told this would not be the case. Articulated lorries tend to use this road as well. 150 homes will only make this worse.</p>	<p>Traffic modelling identified no issues that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways’ authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been</p>	<p>None.</p>
--------------------	---	------------------	--	---	--------------

				incorporated into the residential development brief.	
Karma McLean	Introduction – paragraph 1.7	Observation	<p>This section refers to a contamination assessment, ecological assessment, transport assessment and travel plan being included in any application. I would like to check that the assessments will include thorough checks for agricultural waste and contamination relating to the old hospital and burial ground. Knotweed also present 8 years ago which needs to be removed. Diseases affecting some trees coincidentally in centre of site, is it necessary to remove them? Once a stream which ran in parallel to houses off Union Lane which back into site and calls to unblock a drain which has caused subsidence for some dwellings (attachments). Closest bus stop is on Somerleyton Road which has thin, unsafe pathways, as does Union Lane leading to The Blue Boar. Speeding</p>	<p>The East Suffolk Local Validation List includes criteria for the various assessments that will be required to support any planning application. Paragraph 4.9 of the residential development brief states that freestanding trees should be retained and enhanced. Paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority. Traffic modelling identified no issues that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways’ authority in the</p>	None.

			is common and pedestrian crossing is not safe.	creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief.	
Jamie Illingsworth	Introduction – general comment	Support	All for properties being built due to national housing shortage. Hopefully there is a local builder employing local contractors so whole area can benefit. I hope there will be some affordable housing to help young families in the area get on the housing ladder. I do believe this would benefit all in the Oulton Village area.	Comments noted. Any future planning applications will need to meet the requirements of policy WLP8.2 Affordable Housing as stated on page 5 of the residential development brief.	None.
Lowestoft Town Council (Sarah Foote)	Introduction – general comment	Observation	Concerns over adequate infrastructure (health centres, GPs, Schools) being provided and the current shortages experienced in Lowestoft are not exacerbated. Former cemetery is protected, should be a condition. Town Council have declared a climate emergency and would ask measures are taken to mitigate environmental and wildlife impacts, and sustainable construction material and methods used.	The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs	None.

				<p>highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief, which includes the potential need for a pre-school. The local Clinical Commissioning Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site. The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered an incorporated into any future proposals. The development framework within the residential development brief highlights a number of considerations that will protect wildlife and habitats and integrate them into the development, such as retaining existing trees and hedgerows and the incorporation of a green corridor. As stated in</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Policy WLP2.14 any planning application for this site will need to be supported by an ecological assessment to determine the existing ecological value of the site. Also, as stated on page 5, any planning application will need to meet the criteria set out in policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. Page 5 of the residential development brief also states that any planning application for the site will also need to meet the criteria of policy WLP 8.28 Sustainable Construction.</p>	
Mrs Bell	Introduction – general comment	Observation	<p>Wonder why areas of Lowestoft, i.e. Jeld Wen site etc. are not being developed instead. It appears that the planning committee are hell bent on taking away large areas of countryside instead of looking at other sites. Surely it would be more acceptable to develop more of Lowestoft than the green areas?</p>	<p>The principle of development on this site was established through the creation of the Local Plan, which is supported by an extensive evidence base and was subject to multiple periods of public consultation, as well as a public examination. The Council does not have the remit to control when a planning application is submitted for a site. The Council must also meet its requirements to deliver a 5 Year Housing Land Supply, therefore the development of greenfield sites, if they come</p>	None.

				forward first, cannot be held off until brownfield sites are developed.	
RSPB (Ian Robinson)	Introduction – general comment	Observation	No specific comments to make regarding this proposal.	Comments noted.	None.
Mr and Mrs MJ Southwell	Introduction – general comment	Observation	Own house that backs on to development site. Site should not be too densely developed and most importantly some green space and mature trees retained. Many of the trees should be subject to a protection order.	The development framework of the residential development brief has been designed to ensure that the site is developed at a suitable density whilst also ensuring green spaces, such as the green corridor and play space, are delivered. Paragraph 4.9 of the residential development brief states that freestanding trees should be retained and enhanced.	None.
Environment Agency	Introduction – general comment	Observation	No specific comments to make regarding this proposal. No restraint within remit. Would echo that necessary ground investigations are completed.	Comments noted.	None.

David Butcher	Introduction – general comment	N/A	No response.	No response.	None.
Bungay Town Council (Jeremy Burton)	Introduction – general comment	Observation	No specific comments to make regarding this proposal.	Comments noted.	None.
Peter Robertson	Introduction	Objection	Objection to all and any building as there is not housing shortage in Suffolk. Only to gain revenue and ‘developers’ destroy natural environment. New developments are cramped, dwellings have small rooms and gardens. Greater demand on services such as schools and doctors, greater congestion and pollution. Only second home owners who wish to come here, driving up housing costs. Developers only care about ‘bottom line’ and affordable housing is a fallacy as it’s not affordable. Ignore peoples comments, needs and desires, do	The principle of development on this site was established through the creation of the Local Plan, which is supported by an extensive evidence base and was subject to multiple periods of public consultation, as well as a public examination. The Council does not have the remit to control when a planning application is submitted for a site. The Council must also meet its requirements to deliver a 5 Year Housing Land Supply, therefore the development of greenfield sites, if they come forward first, cannot be held off until brownfield sites are	None.

			<p>not want to live in concrete jungle. Only Brownfield sites should be developed.</p>	<p>developed. The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief, which includes the potential need for a pre-school. The local Clinical Commissioning Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Mr Newsome	Introduction – general comment	Observation	Development fails to consider poor bus provision. Site needs a bus service to be funded or supported between Lowestoft and Blundeston via Parkhill.	Bus stops are located within a 5 minute walking distance from the site, with others being located within 10 minutes. However, the provision of the bus services are outside of the remit of the Council.	None.
David Leeves	Introduction – general comment	Objection	Found comments system difficult to navigate. Already difficult to pull out of junction at Union Lane, this site will only increase traffic in area. Worried about impact on wildlife, endangered bat species has been identified in local area, what assurances can be made that this has been considered? Why is this site being developed over derelict sites. Natural beauty of area should be preserved. Understand need for housing but where will it end? Needs to be a balance with preserving environment and communities.	The consultation system used by the Council is designed by a third party and, while the Council has taken steps to make it as easy to use as possible, there are some elements that are beyond the Councils control. Traffic modelling identified no issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. The development framework within the residential development brief highlights a number of considerations that will protect wildlife and habitats and integrate	None.

				<p>them into the development, such as retaining existing trees and hedgerows and the incorporation of a green corridor. As stated in Policy WLP2.14 any planning application for this site will need to be supported by an ecological assessment to determine the existing ecological value of the site. Also, as stated on page 5, any planning application will need to meet the criteria set out in policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. The Council does not have the remit to control when a planning application is submitted for a site. The Council must also meet its requirements to deliver a 5 Year Housing Land Supply, therefore the development of greenfield sites, if they come forward first, cannot be held off until brownfield sites are developed.</p>	
Simon Baldry	Introduction – general comment	Observation	How has consultation been undertaken during pandemic? Only saw consultation after reading article on Lowestoft Journal, how does this help elderly residents with no internet? No notice in free	<p>The consultation for the residential development brief followed the processes outlined in the East Suffolk Statement of Community Involvement as closely as possible without breaking the national</p>	None.

			<p>papers, would like to see evidence of measures such as social media. Comment's system is difficult to navigate and signs you out automatically. Road infrastructure is not suitable, with narrow roads and paths and drivers ignoring speed limits. 70% travel over 25mph in 20mph zone. Development will significantly increase this issue. Being used as shortcut to A1117 using a sharp bend. Will a full environmental and wildlife study be undertaken? Doctors and chemist recently closed, are current and future needs taken into consideration? Will an additional bus route create more heavy goods vehicle traffic on Oulton Street? New path will not help those who need to walk along Oulton Street. Building waste already being dumped on burial site, what surveys and assurances will be taken to preserve the area? Why is this site being developed before brownfield sites?</p>	<p>restrictions put in place due to the Covid-19 pandemic.. This included sending emails to everyone listed on the Local Plan and related documents mailing list and publicising on social media. The consultation system used by the Council is designed by a third party and, while the Council has taken steps to make it as easy to use as possible, there are some elements that are beyond the Councils control. Traffic modelling identified no issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief, which includes the potential need for a pre-school. The local Clinical Commissioning Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site. The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered an incorporated into any future proposals. The Council does not have the remit to control</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				when a planning application is submitted for a site. The Council must also meet its requirements to deliver a 5 Year Housing Land Supply, therefore the development of greenfield sites, if they come forward first, cannot be held off until brownfield sites are developed.	
Andrew Carver	Introduction	Observation	Infrastructure needs are increasing without the development, such as Oulton doctor's surgery closing, more pressure on Bridge Road Surgery. Train crossing at Oulton Broad North already causes delays with will be made worse by around 500 new people on development. Is this development for good of the people or to make money?	The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief, which includes the potential need for a pre-school. The local Clinical Commissioning	None.

				<p>Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site. Traffic modelling identified no issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief.</p>	
K Gentry	Introduction – general comment	Observation	<p>Bring chaos to roads which are narrow and get very congested. Must be considered where new residents will find new doctors and dentists as it is hard enough already for existing residents. Where are necessary bus services to come from?</p>	<p>Traffic modelling identified no issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the</p>	None.

				<p>brief. The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief, which includes the potential need for a pre-school. The local Clinical Commissioning Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site. Bus stops are located within a 5 minute walking distance from the site, with others being located within 10 minutes. However, the provision of</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				the bus services are outside of the remit of the Council.	
Historic England	Introduction – general comment	Observation	No specific comments at this time. Suggest seeking specialist conservation and archaeological advisors as relevant. Not necessary to be consulted again on this document unless there are material changes.	Comments noted.	None.
Jordan Egerton	Introduction – general comment	Observation	Worried development will negatively impact house prices in the area. If so, will homeowners be compensated for this?	The impact on local housing prices is not a material consideration when determining a planning proposal as defined by national law, therefore this cannot be a reason to reject or change such a proposal.	None.
National Grid (Avison Young)	Introduction – general comment	Observation	No comments.	Comments noted.	None.

Historic England	Introduction – general comment	Observation	No specific comments on the Strategic Environmental Assessment at this time. Suggest seeking specialist conservation and archaeological advisors as relevant. Not necessary to be consulted again on this document unless there are material changes.	Comments noted.	None.
Christine Boar	Introduction – general comment	Objection	Issue with parking at Gresham Avenue post office. How will roads cope with 150 homes resulting in 300-450 new vehicles? Woods Loke school is full. Oulton Street is busy and narrow, hard to pull out of Oulton Road North. Aldi traffic lights are already busy. Please sort out road infrastructure. Other areas of land within town that could be developed first. Do not take down trees as they will be needed to accommodate additional pollution.	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the	None.

				<p>site safe. The Council does not have the remit to control when a planning application is submitted for a site. The Council must also meet its requirements to deliver a 5 Year Housing Land Supply, therefore the development of greenfield sites, if they come forward first, cannot be held off until brownfield sites are developed. Paragraph 4.9 of the residential development brief states that freestanding trees should be retained and enhanced.</p>	
<p>Suffolk County Council (Growth, Highways and Infrastructure – Cameron Clow)</p>	<p>Introduction – general comment</p>		<p>Welcome the brief and appreciate engagement during drafting. May be helpful for brief to state that this is not a comprehensive list of infrastructure requirements, particularly offsite such as school places. Welcome reference to potential need for early years setting, is needed should be easily accessible and near walking and cycling infrastructure, ideally on eastern side. Flood Risk and water Management Team welcome approach to flooding. Would be helpful for flood risk assessment to be included in paragraph 1.7. Site</p>	<p>Comments noted. Agreed, the infrastructure requirements listed in the residential development brief should not be considered comprehensive and may evolve over time. Any development on this site will be required to meet the criteria of policy WLP8.31 Lifetime Design which includes requirements for designing developments considering those with illnesses such as dementia.</p>	<p>The residential development brief framework has been reworded to state that the infrastructure requirements currently included should not be considered exhaustive.</p>

			<p>is located within Middle Super Output Area Waveney 003, within Oulton ward and South Waveney Primary Care Network. Oulton Ward currently has a higher level of residents aged 65 or older (24.6%) than Suffolk and England. Includes relatively deprived and affluent areas. Population aged over 65 predicted to increase by 28.6% between 2017 and 2028. Therefore, area performs worse than England as a whole in regard to long term illnesses and disability. Unemployment is also significantly worse. Need to accommodate with designs for those with limited mobility and dementia, this should be referenced in the development framework. Support proposed walking and cycling infrastructure.</p>		
Oulton Parish Council (Lynne Ward)	Introduction – general comment	Observation	<p>Held consultation event including presenting consultation documents to provide opportunity for those without internet access. Paragraph 1.2 states that brief was prepared in collaboration with landowner, Suffolk County Council and Oulton Parish Council. Parish Council were</p>	<p>The principle of development on this site was established through the creation of the Local Plan, which is supported by an extensive evidence base and was subject to multiple periods of public consultation, as well as a public examination. Throughout this</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.2 of the residential development brief has been reworded to state that the landowners,</p>

			<p>not happy with proposals and suggested Lilac and Lavender Lodge should be asked if they would consider the site for their expansion plans. Also note that Consultation Statement refers to an initial consultation in 2020 that consulted parishes not relevant to Oulton.</p> <p>Following comments were agreed: Environmental Impact Study is required over concerns of contamination.</p> <p>Trees have already been removed impacting on wildlife.</p> <p>Environmental wildlife study needs to be conducted due to nearby marshes.</p> <p>Drainage issues have been increasing since development of nearby estate, site is also on a floodplain.</p> <p>Oulton Street has a very narrow pavement forcing pedestrians onto road to pass each other and must contend with speeding traffic.</p> <p>150 homes could lead to 300 new cars. 72,000 vehicles recorded per month by OPC Speed Information Device, increased to 135,000 since</p>	<p>process the site was identified as suitable for residential development. Paragraph 1.2 of the residential development brief has been reworded to state that the landowners, Suffolk County Council and Oulton Parish Council were engaged in the process. The comments and responses, including those of the various Parish Councils, included in the Initial Consultation Statement were responses that were received during the consultation on the draft template for the residential development briefs would take place in spring 2020. The comments do not relate to the residential development brief for WLP2.14. As stated in policy WLP2.14, any planning application will need to be supported by a contamination assessment, ecological assessment, transport assessment and travel plan. Any planning application will also need to provide relevant supporting documents as outlined in the East Suffolk Local Validation List. Any planning application will also need</p>	<p>Suffolk County Council and Oulton Parish Council were engaged in the process.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>lockdown lifted. 69% speed through the area.</p> <p>No confidence that ESC will sort out traffic issues, access will be dangerous.</p> <p>Proposed entrance is opposite listed buildings.</p> <p>Union Lane crossroads is an accident black spot, no lighting or street paths.</p> <p>Cycleways should be incorporated into roads and should not lead to loss of fields.</p> <p>Emphasis should be on brownfield sites before greenfield.</p> <p>Already enough development in area with Woods Meadow and Land North of Lowestoft (1400 homes)</p> <p>Lack of local amenities, constant reliance on vehicles.</p> <p>Local infrastructure is already stretched, Bridge Road Surgery at capacity and dentists not taking on new patients.</p> <p>Oulton neighbourhood Plan has identified need for homes for elderly, such as bungalows.</p> <p>Suffolk Heritage Map Explorer refers to WWII defensives systems</p>	<p>to meet the criteria of the planning policies listed on page 5, which includes policies covering housing mix and tenure, biodiversity and sustainable construction.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.9 of the residential development brief states that freestanding trees should be retained and enhanced. Paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority. The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p>and pillboxes at Airey Close and Blue Boar, not reference in brief. Letter received from resident who stated that machinery and soil heaps located on burial ground. Sent to MP who said he would take this up with Council. Brief Historical Report was prepared on Oulton Workhouse in 2017. 896 men, women and children interred at burial ground. 1890 Board of Guardian reported drainage issues.</p>	<p>of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe. The Council does not have the remit to control when a planning application is submitted for a site. The Council must also meet its requirements to deliver a 5 Year Housing Land Supply, therefore the development of greenfield sites, if they come forward first, cannot be held off until brownfield sites are developed. The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief, which includes the potential need for a pre-school. The local Clinical Commissioning Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site. The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered an incorporated into any future proposals.</p>	
V T Hathway	Introduction – general comment	Objection	<p>Can't see why this site should be developed when main access is via a B Road which becomes narrower as you enter the village. Both sides are little more than lanes and used as 'rat-runs' between Somerleyton</p>	<p>The principle of development on this site was established through the creation of the Local Plan, which is supported by an extensive evidence base and was subject to multiple periods of public</p>	None.

			<p>Road and the B1375, as well as access for Stirling Close. Junction at Somerleyton Road and Oulton Road North is used as a crossing point for school children attending Benjamin Britten School and as a drop off area, bring traffic to a halt. An additional 150 extra vehicles could be a detriment to road safety. Little information provided on how these will be overcome. Already a problem with speeding vehicles and weight of vehicles allowed through the village. Pavements are narrow. Little mention of facilities for additional 150 families, appears Oulton is slowly being absorbed into Lowestoft.</p>	<p>consultation, as well as a public examination. The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.</p>	
<p>Water Management Alliance (Elanor Roberts)</p>	<p>Introduction</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>No comments.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p>Geoffrey Hawes</p>	<p>Introduction – general comment</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>Live in Grade II listed building opposite site entrance, concerned over safety and convenience. Previous owner denied additional access for 1 or 2 cars, surely 300 cars will be more dangerous. Roads are becoming busier especially junction of Union Lane, Parkhill and Oulton Road North. How will the access be developed? Would it be better to join to Union Lane and create a roundabout at Union Lanes access to Parkhill? What will be done to encourage road users to use Millennium Way? Could access to Parkhill be restricted to residents only? Refer to needing to account for impact on listed buildings but with this development we will be surrounded, broken hedge on Parkhill will not compensate for the impacts. Also concerned over the impacts on flooding from these new developments either side as water table is high, could measures be put towards the west of the site? Could development closest to the listed buildings be one storey? Water pressure is low and getting</p>	<p>The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe. Any development on the site will need to consider how it will impact the setting of the two listed buildings on the opposite side of Parkhill due to their statutory protection. Paragraph 4.10 also highlights some considerations that could be</p>	<p>None.</p>
-----------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	--	---	--------------

			worse. Need to be assured that path along new housing will be wide and safe enough to access from other side of road, paths further down are dangerously narrow. Need to greatly consider access to site, 20mph signing should be taken further up Parkhill, almost up to hotel. Work should not begin until development on Badger Building site has been completed and only take place between 8am and 5pm on weekdays.	incorporated to protect the settings of these buildings. Paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority. The Council does not have the remit to control when a planning application is submitted for a site. Conditions relating to the safe construction of the site will be established at the planning application stage.	
Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (Angela Kempen)	Introduction – general comment	Observation	No specific comments however would request that any new proposal regarding build for access or water for fire-fighting provision is submitted to the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service via the normal consultation process.	Comments noted.	None.
Kate Wagner	Introduction – general comment	Observation	No comments as not statutory consultee. (Health and Safety Executive)	Comments noted.	None.

<p>Broads Authority (Cheryl Peel)</p>	<p>Introduction – general comment</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>Landscape Officer: Approximately 50m from nearest boundary to broads, visual effects may be limited due to intervening woodland and planting. Several footpaths between site and Broads area, need to consider in terms of opportunities and impacts. Need to fully consider impact on Broads possibly through Landscape Visual Impact Assessment for a development of this size. Despite potential lack of visual impact this still needs to be considered as part of masterplan next steps. Will depend largely on scale of buildings being developed. Planting along western edge could help mitigate any impacts. Environment officer: fully support inclusion of RAMS and development should incorporate green space for leisure to reduce need for travel. Large freestanding trees should be retained where possible, hedgerows that are retained should be enhanced and a green corridor should be incorporated into the site. Dog waste bins should be provided on</p>	<p>Comments noted. Page 3 of the residential development brief states that any future planning applications will need to meet the criteria of policy WLP8.35 Landscape Character which makes specific reference to the Broads and the Broads Landscape Character Assessment, meaning there will need to be consideration of the Broads area through the design of any scheme. Paragraphs 4.6 and 4.11 of the residential development brief both outline how open spaces should be incorporated into a development on this site. Paragraph 4.9 of the residential development brief states that freestanding trees should be retained and enhanced. Comments from Suffolk Wildlife Trust will be sort where there is the potential for impacts on County Wildlife Sites.</p>	<p>None.</p>
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	---	---	--------------

			footpaths. Suffolk Wildlife Trust should be consulted as early as possible on potential impacts on County Wildlife Sites.		
Suffolk County Council (Hannah Cutler)	Introduction – general comment	Observation	Included copy of advice provided regarding former Lothingland Hospital and Parkhill sites during Local Plan consultations. Historic burial ground does present a constraint and site should be subject to up front archaeological research, assessment and evaluation. This should inform the design of the site and should be avoided despite apparently being damaged in part already. Will also allow mitigation strategy to be determined. Eastern part of the site will also require archaeological evaluation, however this can be part of a condition of any granted planning permission.	Comments noted. The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered an incorporated into any future proposals.	None.

Stephen Bould	Introduction – general comment	Observation	States that if further evidence comes to light a different approach may need to be taken. This is now the case as there has been growing awareness in the area that this proposal has serious demographic, environmental and transport implications and will have serious deleterious consequences.	Comments noted. The principle of development on this site was established through the creation of the Local Plan, which is supported by an extensive evidence base and was subject to multiple periods of public consultation, as well as a public examination.	None.
Natural England (Sam Kench)	Introduction – general comment	Observation	No objection if appropriate mitigation is secured. Without mitigation could have an adverse effect on Benacre to Easton Bavents Lagoons SAC, Benacre to Easton Bavents SPA and Pakefield to Easton Bavents SSSI. Advise contributions to RAMS and inclusion of well-designed open green space. Located close to Broads National Park, national and local policies should be used in determination, such as NPPF paragraph 172. Landscape advisor/planner for the Broads will be best placed to advise. Any proposal should incorporate measures to improve access to natural environment, such as new footpaths and bridleways and further links to the green	Comments noted. Paragraphs 1.9 and 1.10 of the residential development brief outlines that the site is subject to RAMS contributions by being located in Zone of Influence B., as well as links to further information on other requirements that may be necessary to mitigate the impacts of the site. Paragraphs 4.6 and 4.11 of the residential development brief both outline how open spaces should be incorporated into a development on this site.	None.

			<p>infrastructure network. Biodiversity Net Gain should be considered through NPPF paragraphs 170 and 175.</p>		
<p>Health and Safety Executive (Shirley Rance)</p>	<p>Introduction – general comment</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>HSE may consider this information should a planning application be made in the vicinity of any relevant explosives site.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Brian Sutton</p>	<p>Introduction – general comment</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>Whole character of northern approaches to Lowestoft will be adversely affected by new housing estates at Woods meadow, Blundeston and Corton. Density proposed on this site is too high with little room for grass verges, open space and greenery.</p>	<p>Page 3 of the residential development brief states that any future planning applications will need to meet the criteria of policy WLP8.35 Landscape Character which makes specific reference to the need to protect the special characteristics of landscape areas. Paragraph 3.13 highlights some of these key elements which will need to be considered by the design of any scheme on this site. The density set out in the residential development brief and policy WLP2.14 is an approximate figure. The final density of the site will need to balance the need to deliver</p>	<p>None.</p>

				housing at a viable level whilst also ensuring good design and delivering the other requirements set out in the policy, such as open space. Paragraphs 4.6 and 4.11 of the residential development brief both outline how open spaces should be incorporated into a development on this site.	
Gaius Hawes	Introduction – general comment	Observation	Burial ground located in north perimeter where 896 unmarked graves are located. Land is not consecrated but all were given Christian burial. A parish church once stood between the hospital and the Somerleyton Road and the old hospital had its own church. I have also been given to understand that Italian prisoners were held there during the war, so where if any of their bodies would be buried.	Comments noted. The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered and incorporated into any future proposals.	None.
Secretary of State for Education	Introduction – general comment	Observation	Please note that any regeneration that will impact on existing school land, whether an appropriation or change of use, may require the prior consent of the Secretary of State for Education. In the first instance queries should be directed	Comments noted.	None.

			to the department's land transactions team.		
Councillor Andree Gee	Introduction – general comment	Observation	Concerned about wording 'approximately 30 dwellings per hectare' and would prefer to be no more than or up to 30. This Opinion is strongly held by the Parish Council and local residents.	The requirement for the site to deliver 'approximately 30 dwellings per hectare' is established in the policy from the adopted Waveney local Plan. As a Supplementary Planning Document, the residential development brief cannot change policy criteria or be contradictory to them, therefore the wording of 'approximately' cannot be changed.	None.
William Robertson	Policy Context – general comment	Observation	Light coloured area at top left is burial ground for several hundred people. There was an agreement with a developer to have the area fenced off, marked with a historic information board and would be landscaped. Trust this will be adhered to. This fact must also be disclosed to future occupants.	The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered an incorporated into any future proposals. The exact nature of these enhancements will be established at the time a planning application is submitted	None.

				or during pre-application discussions.	
George Redpath	Policy Context – Figure 1 Policy WLP2.14		Where referencing new pedestrian and cycle access on Union Lane, change should to must. National priority and financial assistance is being offered. Development must be linked to town centre. Also, why can I not cut and paste into box when making comments?	The Council and the residential development acknowledge the importance of pedestrian and cycle connections to make new developments sustainable. The Council will expect the connections outlined in the residential development brief to be explored. Policy WLP2.14 is part of the Waveney Local Plan went through public examination to ensure it was ‘sound’ and was subsequently adopted in March 2019. The residential development brief, once adopted, will be a Supplementary Planning Document. Therefore, while it will carry weight during the determination of a planning application, it cannot change or add additional policy criteria. The consultation software used by the Council is created by a third party	None.

				and therefore the Council cannot change how the system operates.	
Cycling UK (John Thompson)	Policy Context – figure 1 Policy WLP2.14	Observation	I would be grateful for the full details of what is proposed for the cycling facility connecting Union Lane. I would also appreciate seeing the Travel Plan.	The full details of the cycling connections to Union Lane and the Travel Plan will be available when a planning application is received.	None.
Oulton Parish Council (Tony Knights)	Policy Context – general comment	Observation	Extremely concerned over vehicular entrance from Parkhill. Latest data speed indicator device shows between 28 th February 2021 and 28 th March 2021 shows 111,085 vehicles travelled southbound, average of 3897 per day. 75% over speed limits with speeds of up to 80mph. Parkhill is single lane in both directions with no pavement, 2 listed buildings and residential properties, and is an unrestricted lorry route. Development would mirror Union Lane which is a dangerous junction. Accidents have happened at the	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a	None.

			junction and along residential properties, but not all reported.	detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.	
Kevin Sullivan	Policy Context – general comment	Observation	Concerned that access appears to be near accident black spot. Would also prefer brownfield sites in Oulton broad to be developed before greenfield.	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which found no issues that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways’ authority in the creation of this residential development brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe. Then the final form of the access to the site will be established. The Council does not have the remit to control when a planning application is submitted for a site. The Council must also meet its requirements to deliver a 5 Year Housing Land Supply,	None.

				therefore the development of greenfield sites, if they come forward first, cannot be held off until brownfield sites are developed.	
Norman Castleton	Policy Context – general comments, paragraph 2.1 and 2.2 and Figure 1 WLP2.14	Observation	Energy and water provision?	The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief. No specific issues relating to energy and water provision were identified by providers.	None.

Young	Policy Context – general comment	Observation	This will cause a lot of traffic and will disrupt the dementia residents at the care home. Nothing came up on searches when buying new house.	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.	None.
Karma McLean	Policy Context – paragraph 2.1	Observation	Environmental impact assessment is required due to potential issues such as pollution, extinction, depletion of resources and habitat destruction. Already concerns about water damage. Once a stream which ran in parallel to	As stated in policy WLP2.14, any planning application will need to be supported by a contamination assessment, ecological assessment, transport assessment and travel plan. Any planning application will also need to provide relevant	None.

			<p>houses off Union Lane which back into site and calls to unblock a drain which has caused subsidence for some dwellings. Will cause extinction of species using are as their home, including pheasants, owls, foxes, muntjac, bats etc. not enough open space has been left in plans. Additional population will causes pollution that will affect wildlife.</p>	<p>supporting documents as outlined in the East Suffolk Local Validation List. Any planning application will also need to meet the criteria of the planning policies listed on page 5, which includes policies covering housing mix and tenure, biodiversity and sustainable construction. Paragraphs 4.6 and 4.11 of the residential development brief both outline how open spaces should be incorporated into a development on this site. The development framework within the residential development brief highlights a number of considerations that will protect wildlife and habitats and integrate them into the development, such as retaining existing trees and hedgerows and the incorporation of a green corridor. As stated in Policy WLP2.14 any planning application for this site will need to be supported by an ecological assessment to determine the existing ecological value of the site. Also, as stated on page 5, any planning application will need to</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>meet the criteria set out in policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. Paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority.</p>	
MacMillan	Policy Context – general comment	Observation	<p>Main concern is extra vehicles coming out to a very tricky junction, can't see how small junction will safely cope with extra vehicles. Theoretically 300 new cars using already dangerous junction. Will there be further funding for doctors?</p>	<p>Traffic modelling did not identify any issues that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and their comments have been incorporated into the brief. The final form of the access to the site will be determined when a detailed proposal has been drafted. The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan</p>	None.

				<p>to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief. The local Clinical Commissioning Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site.</p>	
Gary Edwards	Policy Context – general comment	Observation	<p>Concern over increased traffic joining busy route from Blundeston Roundabout heading towards Oulton Broad. Minimum 2 additional vehicles per dwelling will add to traffic issues, especially each time railway barrier is used in Oulton Broad North and South Stations. Design and access to</p>	<p>The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The</p>	None.

			Parkhill will cause frustration and accidents cannot be ruled out. What has been put in place to negate this?	Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and their comments have been incorporated into the brief. The final form of the access to the site will be determined when a detailed proposal has been drafted.	
Gary Edwards	Policy Context – general comment	Observation	Same as above.	Same as above.	None.
Stephen Reeves	Policy Context – general comment	Observation	Whole area has a lovely countryside feel. To 'gentrify' footpaths and widen them would spoil this, would strongly object to this. Union Lane is narrow and is walked a great deal. Already been several near misses, to increase traffic would only bring forward an accident.	Page 3 of the residential development brief states that any future planning applications will need to meet the criteria of policy WLP8.35 Landscape Character which makes specific reference to the need to protect the special characteristics of landscape areas. Paragraph 3.13 highlights some of these key elements which will need to be considered by the design of any scheme on this site. Traffic modelling did not identify any issues that could not be mitigated	None.

				<p>against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and their comments have been incorporated into the brief. The final form of the access to the site will be determined when a detailed proposal has been drafted.</p>	
Roger Hillier	<p>Policy Context – figure 1 Policy WLP2.14</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>Greatly concerned about size of development. Originally set for 24 dwellings per hectare, how has this been able to change as this increases the traffic using Parkhill. Traffic constantly speeds through the village and junction at Union Lane can be dangerous already. Accidents will be likely at new junction. How can a pavement be extended that is already too narrow on Parkhill.</p>	<p>The density set out in the residential development brief and policy WLP2.14 is an approximate figure. The final density of the site will need to balance the need to deliver housing at a viable level whilst also ensuring good design and delivering the other requirements set out in the policy, such as open space. Traffic modelling did not identify any issues that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation</p>	<p>None.</p>

				<p>of this residential development brief and their comments have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.</p>	
<p>Norman Castleton</p>	<p>Policy context – general comment, paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 and Figure 1 Policy WLP2.14</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>Who are these houses for? Ring fence affordable housing for those who need it. Energy and water provision? Environmental protection and mitigation measures? Transportation? Every element of this is general with no specific targets, allowing developers to get away with absolute minimums.</p>	<p>Any future planning applications will need to meet the requirements of policy WLP8.2 Affordable Housing as stated on page 5 of the residential development brief. The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services</p>	<p>None.</p>

				have been incorporated into the residential development brief, which includes the potential need for a pre-school.	
Karen Hillier	Policy context – general comment	Observation	Original intentions stated 24 dwellings per hectare, now risen to 30! Vehicular access will add extra traffic to village on a road that is already difficult to access at peak times. Abundance of wildlife on site. 150 dwellings will destroy our view and place home in the middle of a housing estate. This will generate noise pollution. A pre-school will create additional noise and traffic.	The density set out in the residential development brief and policy WLP2.14 is an approximate figure. The final density of the site will need to balance the need to deliver housing at a viable level whilst also ensuring good design and delivering the other requirements set out in the policy, such as open space. The impact on views from existing dwellings close to a development site is not a material consideration as defined by national law when determining a planning application or considering a site for allocation. Traffic modelling did not identify any issues that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation	None.

				of this residential development brief and their comments have been incorporated into the brief. The final highway and access layout of the site will be determined at the planning application stage.	
Philip Monument	Policy context – general comment	Observation	Consideration of a pre-school setting? Already need to wait weeks for doctors appointment and now want to add more people. Need to consider another medical centre not another school, and a village shop!	The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief, which includes the potential need for a pre-school. The potential need for a pre-school setting has been highlighted by Suffolk County Council as the lead	None.

				education provider. The need for this will be established at the time of a planning application. The local Clinical Commissioning Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site.	
Chris Edwards	Policy context – general comment and Figure 1 Policy WLP2.14	Observation	Comment on behalf of Justin Dowley: This site sets a precedent for future development on other sites. Complies with proposed development which was found sound at examination. Note the low land values in area which could lead to lower levels of affordable housing. Landowner collaboration is not a prerequisite for a site to come forward and a lack of does not mean a site cannot come forward. If this is being set out as a prerequisite this is hereby challenged.	Comments noted. Any future planning applications will need to meet the requirements of policy WLP8.2 Affordable Housing as stated on page 5 of the residential development brief. The Council has engaged with multiple stakeholders for this site during the drafting of the residential development brief. Whilst this is not a requirement, this was done to ensure that the content of the document will bring forward the most appropriate development on the site.	None.
Stephen Bould	Policy context – general comment	Observation	WLP8.2 Assume that those who take up affordable housing have less disposable income, therefore provision of proper pedestrian access and protection against flooding will be more even more	Comments noted. Paragraphs 4.18 – 4.20 highlight the importance of walking and cycling infrastructure and where this should be located to ensure the site is connected to the wider area. Paragraphs 4.14	None.

			<p>important. WLP8.21 Sustainable transport is laudable but unformed by experience. B1375 is dangerous and inadequate. WLP8.24 this development will significantly increase non-porous areas and adversely affect natural drainage.</p>	<p>and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority. The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

<p>Scott Miles</p>	<p>Understanding the Place – general comment and Figure 2</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>Builders already been in and cleared some land. This has had a disastrous effect on habitats and animals including deer and owls. Won't be long until newts and frogs are gone as well. Also concerned over water levels and flooding when natural drainage is removed. Already waterlogged in winter. Concerned about being overlooked.</p>	<p>The development framework within the residential development brief highlights a number of considerations that will protect wildlife and habitats and integrate them into the development, such as retaining existing trees and hedgerows and the incorporation of a green corridor. As stated in Policy WLP2.14 any planning application for this site will need to be supported by an ecological assessment to determine the existing ecological value of the site. Also, as stated on page 5, any planning application will need to meet the criteria set out in policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. Paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority.</p>	<p>None.</p>
--------------------	---	--------------------	---	--	--------------

Roger Hillier	Understanding the Place – paragraph 3.9	Observation	Existing issues with sewerage system which needs to be looked into.	Paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority.	None.
Karen Hillier	Understanding the Place – general comment	Observation	Consideration needs to be given to the dwellings that overlook the area, currently look over countryside. If given permission will be in the middle of a housing estate. We do not want to lose the wildlife and peace of the countryside.	The impact on views from existing dwellings close to a development site is not a material consideration as defined by national law when determining a planning application or considering a site for allocation.	None.
Sally Cook	Understanding the Place – general comment	Objection	Vehemently oppose this development on the basis of no further habitats being destroyed. There is far too much development on ‘green sites’, where is wildlife supposed to go? Only development should be redevelopment of buildings and brownfield land. Proposed access onto Union Lane is absurd as already busy, pavement only part way down and is narrow. Junction at Union Lane and Oulton Street is already busy	The development framework within the residential development brief highlights a number of considerations that will protect wildlife and habitats and integrate them into the development, such as retaining existing trees and hedgerows and the incorporation of a green corridor. As stated in Policy WLP2.14 any planning application for this site will need to be supported by an ecological assessment to determine the	None.

			<p>at peak times with numerous accidents. Oulton is a village and should remain so, developments will destroy this.</p>	<p>existing ecological value of the site. Also, as stated on page 5, any planning application will need to meet the criteria set out in policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. The Council does not have the remit to control when a planning application is submitted for a site. The Council must also meet its requirements to deliver a 5 Year Housing Land Supply, therefore the development of greenfield sites, if they come forward first, cannot be held off until brownfield sites are developed. The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

				on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.	
Oulton Ben	Understanding the Place – general comment	Support	Generally a good choice of site, the proposal is supported. However, paragraph 4.21 gives rise to some concern.	Comments noted.	None.
Stephen Bould	Understanding the Place – general comment	Observation	The map is significantly out of date – fails to show almost completed development of Fallowfields to same intensity as Millennium Way. 3.1 – whole of eastern and southern parts of the present parish have been built over since late 1960s, leaving only a fringe of its original rural character to the north and west. This development will further erode that fringe and create third large extension of Lowestoft urban area.	Comments noted. The Fallowfields development is not referenced and mapped on figures 2 and 5 of the residential development brief. Page 3 of the residential development brief states that any future planning applications will need to meet the criteria of policy WLP8.35 Landscape Character which makes specific reference to the Broads and the Broads Landscape Character Assessment, meaning there will need to be consideration of the Broads area through the design of any scheme.	The Fallowfields development is not referenced and mapped on figures 2 and 5 of the residential development brief.

Suffolk County Council – Growth, Highways and Infrastructure (Cameron Clow)	Understanding the Place – general comment	Observation	It may be helpful to highlight other permitted development and local plan allocations. Could be used to make clear links between developments, especially WLP2.15 on figure 2 and 4.	Comments noted. The Fallowfields development is not referenced and mapped on figures 2 and 5 of the residential development brief.	The Fallowfields development is not referenced and mapped on figures 2 and 5 of the residential development brief.
Cycling UK (John Thompson)	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraph 3.14	Observation	As trees do not have tree protection orders, will they be removed? If so, will they be mitigated?	The residential development brief states that existing trees on the site should be retained in incorporated into the development wherever possible. This works in conjunction with Policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity which looks to retain and enhance the natural environment where possible.	None.
Scott Miles	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraph 3.19	Observation	Water table already high, especially since trees have been cleared. Need to consider drainage once natural drainage is gone.	Paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority.	None

Karma McLean	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraphs 3.17 and 3.19	Observation	Already calls to unblock a drain that is overflowing on Parkhill and back gardens have subsided slightly (attachments). Land area and drainage needs to be assessed prior to the additional houses being built.	Paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed as part of any planning application. The results of these studies will be used to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority.	None.
Roger Hillier	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraphs 3.14 and 3.19	Observation	Some trees already cut down so concerned more will follow if no TPOs. Trees and hedgerows along the edges should be protected. Wildlife relies on trees for habitats. Site gets very wet and ditches have got very close to over flowing.	The residential development brief states that existing trees on the site should be retained in incorporated into the development wherever possible. This works in conjunction with Policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity which looks to retain and enhance the natural environment where possible. Paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County	None.

				Council as the lead local flood authority.	
Stephen Bould	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraph 3.15	Observation	The Grade II listed properties up to three years ago were surrounded on all four sides by open land and woodland. With this site they will be surrounded on three sides by dense housing of entirely different age and character. This does not constitute taking full account of their setting in terms of potential impacts on significance.	The principle of development on this site was established through the creation of the Local Plan, which is supported by an extensive evidence base and was subject to multiple periods of public consultation, as well as a public examination. Paragraph 4.10 of the residential development brief highlights considerations that should be incorporated into any development on the site to make the development sympathetic to the nearby listed buildings.	None.
Stephen Bould	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraph 3.18	Observation	Is the Council absolutely sure that there is no remains of unauthorised animals burials following disease, especially in the area of the proposed children’s recreation area?	Policy WLP2.14 states that a contamination assessment is required as part of any planning application. This will determine if there are any contamination issues on this site and how these should be mitigated.	None.

Stephen Bould	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraph 3.19	Observation	This paragraph shows that proper drainage is necessary and may not be possible what specific plans have been made to improve sewerage in this area? Already insufficient drainage in some areas leading to frequent flooding. 150 dwellings will generate a large amount of sewerage and hard surfaces with increase load.	Paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 outline requirements regarding drainage including additional investigations that are needed to fully establish what would be appropriate for the site. These requirements have been drafted in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority.	None.
Jonathan Hawes	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraph 3.16	Observation	As you know this site contains a historic burial ground used between 1834 and 1899 where at least 896 people are interred (historic report attached). Land is not consecrated, but would like to know what considerations and/or amendments are being made in regards to the burial ground in the planning of the redevelopment of the land.	The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered an incorporated into any future proposals. The exact nature of these enhancements will be established at the time a planning application is submitted or during pre-application discussions.	None.
Brian Sutton	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraph 3.14	Observation	The freestanding trees should be protected by orders as art of a plan, Trees - mature ones 50-100 years and loss great for biodiversity.	Comments noted. Paragraph 4.9 of the residential development brief states that freestanding trees should be retained and enhanced.	None.

Brian Sutton	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraph 3.16	Observation	Not happy that the burial site be so encroached upon by 150 dwellings. It should not be included in the whole site.	The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered an incorporated into any future proposals.	None.
Brian Sutton	Natural and Historic Environment – paragraph 3.12	Observation	These woods and meadows will be adversely affected by 150 houses, cars, pollution of the air, noise. All within 1km of the new build. It will spoil a relatively untouched and pristine area, where nature thrives. Orchids are in the woods along with bluebells, and a wide variety of birds, mammals.	The development framework within the residential development brief highlights a number of considerations that will protect wildlife and habitats and integrate them into the development, such as retaining existing trees and hedgerows and the incorporation of a green corridor. As stated in Policy WLP2.14 any planning application for this site will need to be supported by an ecological assessment to determine the existing ecological value of the site. Also, as stated on page 5, any planning application will need to meet the criteria set out in policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	None.

Cycling UK (John Thompson)	Movement – paragraph 3.24	Observation	Is there the possibility of bus stops being located closer to the site?	Bus stops are located within a 5 minute walking distance from the site, with others being located within 10 minutes. However, the provision of the bus services are outside of the remit of the Council.	None.
John Rigby	Movement – paragraph 3.24	Observation	Error – states that Crestview Medical Centre is 0.5 miles to east and Aldi Grocery shop is 0.8 miles to west. Both locations are east and Aldi is closer than Crestview Medical Centre.	Comments noted. The locations and distances referenced in paragraph 3.24 have been checked and corrected where they were incorrect.	Locations and distances in paragraph 3.24 have been corrected where necessary.
Karma McLean	Movement – paragraphs 3.20 – 3.24	Observation	Closest bus stop is on Somerleyton Road, with only thin unsafe pathways leading to it. Roadway is also narrow, especially when trucks use it. Speed restrictions being monitored and speeding is common, Union Lane and Parkhill crossroads very dangerous, only be added to with additional 150 dwellings.	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a	None.

				detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.	
British Horse Society (Charlotte Ditchburn)	Movement – general comment	Observation	No objection to the application in principle but believes for this to be compliant with National and Local policies the proposed cycling and walking infrastructure throughout the site should be multi-user routes for all non-motorised users including equestrians. Evidence suggested a number of routes around the site are under recorded as footpaths and could reasonably subsist at bridleway status. Application for this likely to be submitted to Suffolk County Council in due course. This would adequately include equestrian access through the site. Support proposal to upgrade Flixton Footpath 6 for its entire length.	Comments noted. Paragraphs 4.18 – 4.20 highlight the importance of walking and cycling infrastructure and where this should be located to ensure the site is connected to the wider area. These sections also highlight, where considered appropriate, it should be explored if these links could be upgraded to bridleways. This should be discussed with Suffolk County Council, by the developer.	None.

George Redpath	Movement – paragraph 3.22	Observation	Imperative that cycling infrastructure is incorporated within and outside site, car must not dominate. Surrounding cycling infrastructure is fragmented not allowing for easy access to town centre. Note that text says cycling infrastructure SHOULD be incorporated, suggest that this is changed to MUST. They must also link up to schools and the town centre, not a token cycle lane on main road.	Comments noted. Paragraphs 4.18 – 4.20 highlight the importance of walking and cycling infrastructure and where this should be located to ensure the site is connected to the wider area. As a Supplementary Planning Document, the residential development brief cannot change policy criteria or be contradictory to them, therefore the wording of ‘should’ cannot be changed.	None.
Stephen Bould	Movement	Observation	All routes at B1375/Union Lane/Oulton Road North crossroads are narrow and dangerous, 150 homes will mean 300-400 people daily increase to flow. B1375 is narrow and ill-lit and used as a ‘rat-run’ for those avoiding A1117. The straight nature of the road tempts drivers to speed and overtake with completely inadequate provision for pedestrians. In practice there will be limited pedestrian traffic and a lot of vehicular traffic. Safe provision of footways along Parkhill onto development need to be made to encourage walking.	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways’ authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief.	None.

			<p>Beneficial to have a walkaway on western side of Parkhill extending to footpath just south of Spinney Farm, leading to The Pastures. Walkways should be developed in conjunction with cycle provision at both Parkhill and Union Lane, as well as improvements to Oulton Street and Oulton Road North. Local facilities are not 'near' and require long journeys on foot or by car on narrow roads.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 4.18 – 4.20 highlight the importance of walking and cycling infrastructure and where this should be located to ensure the site is connected to the wider area, including connections on Union Lane and Parkhill. Some services are shown to be within a 10-minute walking distance from the site. Developing the pedestrian and cycle connections will further encourage walking and cycling which could extend to areas beyond these.</p>	
Brian Sutton	Movement – paragraphs 3.21 – 3.24	Observation	<p>These paragraphs show the real isolation of this "island" of proposed housing. This is looking a community on the edge of so many facilities, and not likely to improve the wellbeing of inhabitants, especially more elderly.</p>	<p>Some services are shown to be within a 10-minute walking distance from the site. Bus stops, which could be used to reach services beyond this, are located within a 5 minute walking distance from the site, with others being located within 10 minutes. The development of walking and cycling infrastructure will help encourage healthy lifestyles. Any development on this site will be required to meet the criteria of policy WLP8.31 Lifetime Design which includes requirements for designing developments</p>	None.

				considering those with illnesses such as dementia.	
Roger Hillier	Creating a Built Form – paragraph 4.5	Observation	Development along the whole of the southern edge of the site should be kept back from the existing housing due the fact that they have very small gardens and they would have their privacy invaded, bearing in mind that they have not been overlooked in the last thirty five years.	Paragraph 4.5 of the residential development brief states that development should be appropriately set back from the dwellings along the southern edge of the site and existing vegetation should be retained where possible.	None.
Stephen Bould	Creating a Built Form – general comment	Observation	Envisage 150 homes with one single access onto Parkhill, do not believe this issue has been properly tackled. Roundabout or traffic lights might help, but long-term better solution would be to abandon provision of a major north/south cut through and cut the road in two between Spinney Farm and the Parkhill Hotel, while at the same time providing two access routes - one via Union Lane and the existing crossroads, and another off Parkhill's southern stretch.	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the	None.

				highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.	
Karma McLean	Landscape and Heritage Integration – paragraphs 4.9 – 4.17	Observation	Development will cause extinction of species that live in this area. Pheasants, owls, foxes, muntjac, bats and more living in this area. Not enough land has been left for natural environment.	The development framework within the residential development brief highlights a number of considerations that will protect wildlife and habitats and integrate them into the development, such as retaining existing trees and hedgerows and the incorporation of a green corridor. As stated in Policy WLP2.14 any planning application for this site will need to be supported by an ecological assessment to determine the existing ecological value of the site. Also, as stated on page 5, any planning application will need to meet the criteria set out in policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	None.

Roger Hillier	Landscape and Heritage Integration – general comment and paragraphs 4.9 – 4.13	Observation	When Lothingland was being developed a ditch was built and subsequently a large oak tree fell in high winds, narrowly missing closest house. All the hedging and trees need to be retained for the sake of the wildlife and the aesthetic appearance, we cannot let this disappear.	The development framework within the residential development brief highlights a number of considerations that will protect wildlife and habitats and integrate them into the development, such as retaining existing trees and hedgerows and the incorporation of a green corridor. As stated on page 5, any planning application will need to meet the criteria set out in policy WLP8.34 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. Paragraph 4.9 of the residential development brief states that freestanding trees should be retained and enhanced.	None.
Stephen Bould	Landscape and Heritage Integration – general comment and paragraph 4.16	Observation	The site includes the burial ground of the old workhouse. I draw your attention to pp. 174-179 of Newsom’s authoritative Faculty Jurisdiction of the Church of England (especially paragraph 3 on p. 176), and to Sections 7 and 8 of the Faculty Jurisdiction Measure 1964, on p. 198 of the same book.	The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered an incorporated into any future proposals. The exact nature of these enhancements will be established at the time a planning application is submitted or during pre-application discussions.	None.

Suffolk County Council – Growth, Highways and Infrastructure (Cameron Clow)	Landscape and Heritage Integration – paragraph 4.17	Observation	Welcome reference to burial ground. Requirement for geophysical surveys could be included in paragraph 1.7. SCC would recommend a commemoration of the burial site included with any open space, which could be added to paragraph 4.17.	Comments noted. The residential development brief and policy WLP2.14 both state that development on the site should enhance the burial ground. The nature of this enhancement will be determined at the planning application stage.	None.
David Henwood	Streets and Movement – general comment	Objection	Strongly object to cycle and pedestrian access to Union Lane as it is too narrow with no room for pathways, used by cars and lorries all day and any walkers need to mount hedges to stay out of the way. Will only lead to accidents if connected.	The residential development brief states that cycling and walking connections should be made onto Union Lane. This means that these connections should only be delivered if they are viable and acceptable to Suffolk County Council as the highways authority. Issues that have been raised in this comment will be considered as part of deciding if proposals are acceptable.	None.
Cycling UK (John Thompson)	Streets and Movement – paragraphs 4.18 – 4.21	Observation	I would appreciate being advised of what precisely is proposed for the cycling facilities once it becomes clearer.	The full details of the cycling connections will be available when a planning application is received.	None.

Oulton Parish Council (Tony Knights)	Streets and Movement – paragraph 4.21	Observation	Extremely concerned over vehicular entrance from Parkhill. Latest data speed indicator device shows between 28 th February 2021 and 28 th March 2021 shows 111,085 vehicles travelled southbound, average of 3897 per day. 75% over speed limits with speeds of up to 80mph. Parkhill is single lane in both directions with no pavement, 2 listed buildings and residential properties, and is an unrestricted lorry route. Development would mirror Union Lane which is a dangerous junction. Accidents have happened at the junction and along residential properties, but not all reported.	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access and highways network within and around the site safe.	None.
A Bodmer	Streets and Movement – general comment		Not opposed to development however very concerned about road access. Parkhill is a very busy road with no footpaths or streetlights. Notorious accident	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found	None.

			black spot and more traffic will only make this worse	that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. The final form of the access to the site will be determined during the planning application process.	
Beccles and Bungay Cycle Strategy (Ian Reid)	Streets and Movement – paragraph 4.20	Observation	Parkhill has no provision for walking or cycling. It is a narrow, busy lane with no pavement or segregated cycle way. Unless this changes then pedestrians and cyclist should be connected to Gorleston Road, Hall Way or Millennium Way.	The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site, either on Parkhill or elsewhere. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the	None.

				highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. The residential development brief highlights a number of pedestrian and cycle connections that should be explored, however this does not preclude other links being explored.	
Karma McLean	Streets and Movement – paragraphs 4.18 – 4.21	Observation	The problem with pedestrian and cycle connection to Union Lane is that they need to come out onto Parkhill or Flixton road, neither of which are safe. Union Lane pathways are thin as is the roadway. Speed restrictions being monitored and speeding is common, Union Lane and Parkhill crossroads very dangerous, only be added to with additional 150 dwellings.	The residential development brief highlights a number of pedestrian and cycle connections that should be explored, however this does not preclude other links being explored. Traffic modelling did not identify any issues that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways’ authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that	None.

				will be needed to make the access to the site safe.	
Sport England (Philip Raiswell)	Streets and Movement – general comment	Support	Sport England support development of footpaths and the need to link them to existing network. Would like to see development to reflect the principles of ‘Active Design’ guidance, which seeks to establish new opportunities for sport and physical activity in new and existing development. Would recommend reference to this in supporting text.	Comments noted. The residential development brief looks to promote the principles of ‘Active Design’ and active lifestyles in general through the provision of walking and cycling connections as well as well integrated and useable open space.	None.
Gary Edwards	Streets and Movement – paragraph 4.19	Observation	Will these footpaths to Union Lane be well lit and who will maintain?	The exact nature of the links to Union Lane will be established at the time of a planning application. They will need to meet the requirements of Suffolk County Council as the highways authority.	None.

<p>Gary Edwards</p>	<p>Streets and Movement – paragraphs 4.19 and 4.21</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>Will these footpaths to union lane be well lit and who will maintain? Junction onto Parkhill is already busy. Concern over additional vehicles which will cause accidents. Emergency vehicles will struggle to get through given width of Parkhill. Additional traffic will only make issues when railway barriers are raised at Oulton Broad North and South stations.</p>	<p>The exact nature of the links to Union Lane will be established at the time of a planning application. They will need to meet the requirements of Suffolk County Council as the highways authority. Traffic modelling did not identify any issues that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways’ authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Roger Hillier</p>	<p>Streets and Movement – general comment</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>Exiting B1375 is often difficult due to speeding traffic. How are you going to stop speeding? Any more traffic will make this more difficult and same problems will occur at new junctions.</p>	<p>The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County</p>	<p>None.</p>

				Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief.	
Philip Monument	Streets and Movement – general comment	Observation	B1375 used as a rat-run, speeding and density of traffic at peak times is horrendous. Cannot cross at Union Lane crossroads. New development will only make this worse. Must considered closing off access to A47 from Oulton village using B1375 to force traffic to use bypass instead.	Traffic modelling did not highlight any issues that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief.	None.
Oulton Ben	Streets and Movement – general comment and paragraph 4.21	Observation	Generally a good choice of site, the proposal is supported. However, paragraph 4.21 gives rise to some concern. B1375 is a busy through road particularly at rush hour. 20mph speed limits and difficult roundabout south outside Old Frank Public House. Frequented by large articulated vehicles. Blind crest outside Parkhill. New residents will probably want to	Comments noted. The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with	None.

			access Tesco, possible road layout improvements to mitigate blind crest and perhaps allied access through Park Meadows onto the A1117 roundabout may be useful consideration.	Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.	
Stephen Bould	Streets and Movement – paragraphs 4.19 and 4.20	Observation	The recognition in this part of the plan of the need for the construction, inter-connection, and protection of footpaths is laudable. Refer back to what I wrote in response under the general heading “Movement,” and at the top of this section under “Creating a Built Form.”	Comments noted.	None.
Brian Sutton	Streets and Movement – paragraph 4.18	Observation	Union Lane is a narrow, congested road in places where extra foot & cycle use is very difficult. What happens when the cycles and people come out on the Oulton St. Junction? It is already very dangerous spot with heavy traffic at times.	The exact nature of the links to Union Lane will be established at the time of a planning application. They will need to meet the requirements of Suffolk County Council as the highways authority.	None.

<p>Brian Sutton</p>	<p>Streets and Movement – paragraphs 4.20 and 4.21</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>Junction for access is one of biggest weaknesses. B1375 is a narrow highway where cars regularly speed. How will cars turn south safely? Bad record for serious accidents and dangerous for additional 150 dwellings. Thought about the movement of children on foot or bikes for Benjamin Britten School? At risk coming out of Union Lane and heading down Oulton Road North, road is heavily parked up and narrow.</p>	<p>The Waveney Local Plan is supported by traffic modelling which evaluated the impact on the growth proposed in the Local Plan, including this site, on the highway network. No issues were found that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Once a detailed proposal has been created for this site there will be further consideration of any necessary highways measures that will be needed to make the access to the site safe.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Mr Holland</p>	<p>Development Framework Map</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>We have enough new housing being built. Local healthcare already struggling and difficult to get appointments at Crestview. Why must we build on every bit of Green Space? If this goes ahead</p>	<p>The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also</p>	<p>None.</p>

			<p>may as well merge Lowestoft with Great Yarmouth.</p>	<p>maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief. The local Clinical Commissioning Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site. The principle of development on this site was established through the creation of the Local Plan, which is supported by an extensive evidence base and was subject to multiple periods of public consultation, as well as a public examination.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

Christine Boar	Development Framework Map	Objection	<p>Have to object. Other areas in Lowestoft should be built first. Do not need more traffic or pollution. Development would bring in 300-450 extra vehicles. Trees should have a preservation order on them. Graves at workhouse should be untouched. Dentists and doctors are overloaded. Gresham Avenue post office hasn't got parking facilities for more people. Woods Loke Primary school is full.</p>	<p>The Council does not have the remit to control when a planning application is submitted for a site. The Council must also meet its requirements to deliver a 5 Year Housing Land Supply, therefore the development of greenfield sites, if they come forward first, cannot be held off until brownfield sites are developed. Traffic modelling did not identify any issues that could not be mitigated against that would mean development could not place on this site. The Council has also worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council as the local highways' authority in the creation of this residential development brief and have provided comments on the highway network which have been incorporated into the brief. Paragraph 4.9 of the residential development brief states that freestanding trees should be retained and enhanced. The historic burial ground has been carefully considered and Policy WLP2.14 requires that any future development should avoid impacts</p>	None.
----------------	---------------------------	-----------	---	---	-------

				<p>on it. The residential development brief also highlights that proposals to enhance this area should be considered an incorporated into any future proposals. The Council worked in collaboration with infrastructure and service providers during the creation of the Waveney Local Plan to establish any infrastructure needs that would be required to support the site. The Council also maintains regular contact with infrastructure providers, including during the creation of the residential development brief, to ensure that new development is supported by the infrastructure that it requires. Any needs highlighted by these providers for them to be able to provide the necessary services have been incorporated into the residential development brief, which includes the potential need for a pre-school. The local Clinical Commissioning Group, as the local healthcare provider, at the time of drafting the brief did not identify any infrastructure needs to support development on this site.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>Oldman Homes</p>	<p>Development Framework Map</p>	<p>Observation</p>	<p>No comments on section 1,2,3 and 4. Objectives of Development Framework are generally supported, however whilst indicative gives rise to a number of issues. Access to the site is restricted to a fixed location to ensure adequate visibility splays. Due to this fixed access point, it is not possible to provide a linear road without resulting in the removal of trees on site, which is contrary to paragraph 4.9 and could undermine the wildlife corridor (paragraph 4.11). Suffolk County Council Highways would be unlikely to support a linear road given that the design would encourage speeding and advise that minor bends are required. It would not be possible to incorporate trees closer than 2m from the adopted highways, meaning the width of the road including pavements and filter drains could potentially be around 20.5m, resulting in a reduction of the developable area of approximately 0.5ha and could result in the loss of existing trees.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council worked in collaboration with Suffolk County Council, as the local highways authority, during the creation of the residential development brief. The County Council provided comments which were incorporated into the draft brief. No reference was made regarding the access to the site having to come from a fixed point. No objection was raised by the County Council is exploring the potential of developing a linear road. Paragraph 4.2 of the residential development brief, which refers to the main access to the site being linear and tree lined, has been reworded to provide further clarity on East Suffolk Councils aims for this element of the site.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.2 has been reworded to make clear the Councils aims for access to and through the site.</p>
---------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------	---	---	--

			<p>Consider that it is possible to prepare a layout which delivers an access road that is generally linear and which retains views as per the aspirations of the Development Brief, but crucially is capable of adoption by Suffolk County Council Highways therefore will require traffic calming bends. In addition, a detailed landscaping scheme can be brought forward which gives the appearance of a tree lined road which, where possible, retains existing trees and does not reduce the area of the site that can be developed.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--