



Suffolk Coastal **Local Plan**

**Analysis of Responses to Issues and Options
Consultation**



First Draft Local Plan | July 2018

Consultation period: 20th July to 14th September 2018

www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/suffolkcoastallocalplanreview



Analysis of the Responses to the Issues and Options Consultation

Consultation Period: 18th August to 30th October 2017

July 2018

Contents

Introduction	3
Consultation and Publicity Summary	4
Key Issues	7
What is the vision for the Ipswich HMA and Ipswich FEA?.....	7
A – How much growth? The number of homes and jobs that should be planned for	10
B - Where should the growth go?	14
C - The provision of retail and leisure development.....	19
D – Infrastructure.....	23
Vision.....	28
Housing	31
Business and Industry	42
Town Centres, Retail and Commercial Leisure	47
Tourism	52
Vehicle Parking.....	58
Community Facilities.....	60
Healthy Communities.....	63
Climate Change	69
Design.....	76
Heritage.....	84
Landscape	87
Biodiversity and Geodiversity	90
Other	95
Summaries of comments received in relation to sites (in Parish order)	97

Introduction

This document provides an analysis of the response to the Issues and Options consultation which was published in August for a period of 10 weeks. The document explains how the Council has taken responses to the consultation into account when preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

The Issues and Options consultation marked the first stage of consultation on the new Local Plan for Suffolk Coastal and invited comments from statutory local plan consultees, Parish and Town Councils, other local and national organisations with an interest in planning and developments, landowners and developers and members of the public.

The consultation took place between 18th August and 30th October 2017. In total 642 individuals and organisations responded to the consultation. Between them they made 6,893 comments. 5,989 comments were made on the questions in the consultation document, with a further 904 comments made on the potential sites for development which were also part of the consultation. Note that some comments received on sites contain comments relating to more than one site. As the comments are ordered by site number within this document, more than one entry may therefore appear. Within the responses to questions 143 and 144 were 351 further specific comments on sites which are also included within this schedule.

Full copies of the responses can be viewed on the Councils interactive consultation software at: <http://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/local-plans/suffolk-coastal-local-plan/online-consultations/>

The Council has read and considered every comment received. Due to the general nature of the questions in the Issues and Options consultation and the number of comments received it has not been possible to respond directly to each individual comment.

This document summarises the responses to each question and details how the Council took those comments into account when formulating the strategy, policies and proposals in the First Draft Local Plan. The document also summarises the comments made on potential site options together with summaries of the site assessments undertaken by the Council which have helped inform which sites to include in the First Draft Local Plan.

Consultation and Publicity Summary

The consultation ran from 18th August until 30th October 2017. Details are provided below as to how the Council promoted and publicised the consultation during that period.

Public exhibitions

A series of public exhibitions held across the District to provide opportunity for the Issues and Options document to be discussed and considered by interested persons. Drop in sessions were held at the locations below, with officers available to discuss the consultation.

Venue	Date and Time
Yoxford Village Hall (Main Hall) Old High Road, Yoxford, IP17 3HN	Monday 11 th September 16.00-19.30
Tower Hall 5 Broadlands Way, Rushmere St Andrew, Ipswich IP4 5SU	Thursday 14 th September 16.00-19.30
Felixstowe Town Hall (Council Chamber) Undercliff Rd W, Felixstowe IP11 2AG	Monday 18 th September 16.00-19.30
Suffolk Coastal District Council (Deben Room) East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, IP12 1RT	Tuesday 26 th September 16.00-19.30
Wenhaston Village Hall Narrow Way, Wenhaston, Halesworth IP19 9DP	Wednesday 27 th September 16.00-19.30
Kirton Recreation Ground (The Pavilion) 12 Alley Rd, Kirton, Ipswich IP10 0NN	Monday 2 nd October 16.00-19.30
Riverside Centre 6 Great Glemham Rd, Stratford St Andrew, IP17 1LL	Wednesday 11 th October 16.00-19.30

Meetings for Town/Parish Councils

A series of meetings were arranged with Town/Parish Councils during the consultation to discuss local issues, ambitions for growth and respond to questions. These were provided on a 1-2-1 basis with members of Town/Parish Councils meeting with officers. All meetings were held at East Suffolk House. In total 57 meetings were held during the consultation.

- Tuesday 19th September 10.00 – 17.00 (7 sessions available);
- Wednesday 20th September 10.00 – 17.00 (7 sessions available);
- Monday 25th September 12.00 – 17.00 (5 sessions available);

- Thursday 28th September 12.00 – 17.00 (5 sessions available);
- Friday 29th September 12.00 – 17.00 (5 sessions available);
- Tuesday 3rd October 12.00 – 17.00 (5 sessions available);
- Thursday 5th October 10.00 – 13.00 (3 sessions available);
- Tuesday 10th October 10.00 – 17.00 (7 sessions available);
- Monday 16th October 10.00 – 17.00 (7 sessions available);
- Wednesday 18th October 10.00 – 17.00 (7 sessions available);

Media and publicity

During the consultation, the Council made use of the local press, social media and other forms of communication to promote the consultation.

Media	Details
Suffolk Coastal Coastline Magazine	Article published in June 2017, highlighting the upcoming consultation and providing details as to how interested persons register their interest ahead of the consultation.
Press release	Published by Suffolk Coastal on Friday 18 th August.
East Suffolk Website	<p>Consultation document and supporting information published on the website from 18th August 2017.</p> <p>Links to interactive consultation software also provided to encourage online responses.</p> <p>Contact details for the Planning Policy & Delivery Team also made available.</p>
Social media	<p>Consultation published on Suffolk Coastal Social Media accounts throughout the consultation:</p> <p>Facebook:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation promoted • Boosted posts throughout the consultation targeted at men and women 18-40 years of age and within 40 miles of Woodbridge. • Posts on Facebook reached 3,637 people. <p>Twitter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular posts throughout the consultation, to promote drop in sessions and issues within the document • Shared by District Councillors and Chief Executive accounts during the consultation.
Consultation leaflets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided to all Town and Parish Councils

	<p>(many requests for additional copies).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided to Doctor and Dentist Surgeries. • Provided at local libraires. • Provided at tourist information centres.
--	---

During the consultation period, various Town and Parish Councils and community organisations included information about the Issues and Options document on their website.

Consultation and publicity materials

Material	Details
Issues and Options document “Help plan the future of the District”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDF version on website • Interactive version on consultation software • Hard copies provided to Town and Parish Councils • Hard copies provided to District Councillors • Had copies provided upon request • Hard copies provided at public exhibitions
Consultation Leaflet	As above, but also provided to local surgeries, local libraries and tourist information centres
Comments form	Available as part of public exhibitions
Consultation poster (promoting drop in sessions)	Sent to all Town and Parish Councils to be displayed on local notice boards.

Part 1

Key Issues

Q01 – Are there any other issues that the Local Plan should consider? (104 responses)

This question resulted in a mixture of responses that identify a number of issues relevant to individual communities and stakeholders across the District. However some common issues resulted including the need to provide and protect the natural environment and character of the District. Respondents identified the exceptional quality of the natural and historic environment and the importance of agriculture to the area both in terms of food production and employment opportunities in the rural areas. Respondents also identified that the separation of settlements is an important characteristic of the area and one which needs to be retained to ensure individual identities and preservation of the rural communities. Some comments highlighted that the level of development coming forward will destroy the character of the rural areas.

Increasing the provision of cycle paths across the District was supported by a number of respondents, as this will help integrate communities and provide opportunities for people to use alternative forms of transport. The contribution these cycle paths make to tourism opportunities was also acknowledged. Other types of infrastructure requirements raised included increasing provision of health facilities across the District, broadband provision to all communities, mobile signal, protection of groundwater sources, increased provision of woodlands and enhancement of biodiversity and habitats across the District.

Some respondents suggested that the Local Plan needs to consider employment and housing together to ensure that opportunities are in place for young people to remain in the area. As well as these opportunities, the Local Plan needs to recognise the changing nature of high streets and promote more boutique style shopping as well as places for leisure time such as eating and drinking. Increasing the places for eating, drinking and socialising will also reduce the level of isolation that in some instances is brought about by the lack of connectivity between areas and amenity uses.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan outlines a variety of key issues based on social, environmental and economic factors which have been identified through the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. Consultation responses have influenced the Scoping Report and the issues identified in the First Draft Plan. The First Draft Plan also includes a number of strategic objectives and priorities which have a clear relationship with the issues identified through the consultation.

What is the vision for the Ipswich HMA and Ipswich FEA?

Q02 – What are the advantages of your area that should be protected through local plans? (85 responses)

- Communities to retain their individual character and not merge with neighbouring communities.
- District is an attractive place to live and work and the environment needs to be protected.
- Essential to retain the rural aspect of villages.
- Important for local communities to retain services and facilities.
- Villages (such as Trimley St Martin) should not become suburbs of neighbouring Towns.
- Retention and protection of the rural character between Ipswich and Felixstowe.
- Carefully considered and appropriate scale development in rural areas to be encouraged.
- Distinctive nature of villages within the setting of protected landscapes should be retained.
- Future development to be in keeping with the existing settlements.
- Protection of flora and fauna.
- Communities to be given time to settle following “new” developments
- Proximity of communities such as Leiston to the AONB.
- Rural tranquillity that promotes and attracts tourism.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a vision for Suffolk Coastal. This vision is based on the East Suffolk Business Plan but also informed by consultation responses which acknowledged the high quality built and natural environment as well as the need to retain local services and facilities. Consultation responses encouraged appropriate development in rural areas whilst maintaining their identity. The vision in the First Draft Plan seeks to ensure that communities have fulfilled their potential by the end of the plan period which supports the responses received.

Q03 – What are the disadvantages of your area that the local plans could try to address through the way land is used or developed? (66 responses)

- Poor digital infrastructure
- High levels of heavy and speeding traffic
- Poor public transport
- Lack of access to health and leisure facilities
- Houses that do not benefit local people – need more low cost housing and bungalows.
- High house prices driven by the second home market and level of tourism in the area.
- New executive unaffordable housing without adequate infrastructure and depopulation of rural villages.
- More space for business development.
- Parking at schools
- Traffic congestion in town centres
- Impact of Port of Felixstowe on quality of life for residents.
- Opportunities for bringing communities together will help build stronger communities.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Some of the issues identified in response to this question echo the issues raised in the East Suffolk Business Plan and the Critical Success Factors outlined within that. The First Draft Plan contains a

range of policies which seeks to address some of these issues. Consultation responses have highlighted the need for greater provision of digital infrastructure and the First Draft Plan includes a policy which takes a proactive approach to the delivery of this much needed infrastructure to support communities across the District. Housing policies seek to boost the supply of housing and target the needs of local people. Other issues identified are included within specific policies or included within Site Allocations as relevant.

Q04 – What are the key priorities you would like to be addressed by 2036 - in the places across Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal where you live, work or study? (78 responses)

- Improve traffic and transport infrastructure to reduce congestion.
- Quality homes which meets the needs of the local population. Concern about the amount of second homes across the District.
- Retention of existing services and facilities and ensure these remain viable.
- Protection of the natural environment and resist building in areas of high landscape quality and ecological value with good environmental practices and carbon neutral development.
- Recognition of the vital need to enhance and protect special areas from development.
- Improvements to the broadband services across the District.
- Enabling communities to have more control over what comes forward in their area, with a greater focus on building smaller and more affordable homes.
- Sensitive development in and on the edge of existing settlements that help to deliver additional services while supporting existing facilities.
- Provision of affordable and specialist housing in the rural areas.
- Keep the rural nature and character of the area by developing on brownfield sites and maintain woods, fields and open spaces.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policies in the First Draft Plan seek to address the key priorities identified through the consultation responses on issues such as landscape, digital infrastructure, design, character and provision of appropriate residential development. The First Draft Plan also provides a vision for specific areas which takes into account the constraints and opportunities for settlements which are based on consultation responses.

Additional evidence has been prepared in respect of Landscape Character and the Port of Felixstowe Study which were also informed by consultation responses.

Consultation responses have also informed discussions and engagement with service providers such as Suffolk County Council and NHS England throughout the plan preparation stages.

Q05 – What is your vision for the Ipswich HMA and Ipswich FEA by 2036? (38 responses)

- Focus on high quality developments which maintain and sustainably improve the area through appropriate development that takes into account the unique characteristics of the District.

- Provide opportunities for people to work and live and where businesses want to invest and innovate.
- Enable communities to thrive in a sustainable way by promoting homes and opportunities targeted at young, working age people.
- Support the county town
- Growth of the area to be considered across the full Housing Market Area.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a vision for Suffolk Coastal. This vision is based on the East Suffolk Business Plan but also informed by consultation responses which acknowledged the high quality built and natural environment as well as the need to retain local services and facilities. Consultation responses encouraged appropriate development in rural areas whilst maintaining their identity. The vision in the First Draft Plan seeks to ensure that communities have fulfilled their potential by the end of the plan period which supports the responses received.

A policy which outlines the growth requirements for Suffolk Coastal, based on evidence prepared across the Ipswich Housing Market Area and the Ipswich Functional Economic Area in conjunction with neighbouring authorities is included in the First Draft Plan. This policy and supporting text acknowledge the strong relationships between Suffolk Coastal and neighbouring authorities.

A – How much growth? The number of homes and jobs that should be planned for

Q06 – Which growth scenario should we plan for across the Ipswich Housing Market Area? (163 responses)

A mixed response to this question with a variety of views expressed by a range of organisations acting on behalf of landowners and the development industry, as well as many comments received from members of the public and Town and Parish Councils. Those who indicated that the baseline figures should be planned for outlined that higher levels of growth would be excessive, detrimental to the environment and the existing communities as well as “risky” in respect of the uncertainties surrounding national issues such as Brexit.

The development industry and those with land interests tended to favour the highest scenarios for growth as this would present greater opportunities for development across the District as well as significantly boosting the supply of housing that is delivered over the plan period. Many respondents make clear links between the higher levels of growth and the benefit this will bring to the local economy as well as seeking to rebalance the increasing ageing population with more opportunities for homes targeted at younger people to ensure they remain in the area.

Comments received from Town/Parish Councils and members of the public generally supported the introduction of the baseline scenario. Comments highlighted that this would meet the needs of the existing population and would be based on robust evidence. High house prices and increased numbers of people moving into the District were identified as reasons to only restrict planned growth to that seen as the baseline. Many respondents also suggested that growth which is above

the baseline figure is likely to be detrimental to the natural environment which is important to preserve for the overall benefit this brings.

Comments were also received which supported Scenario B, as this option was considered to be more realistic and offered a level of flexibility. Responses highlighted that Scenario B could help deliver an increased number of units that are required but also protect the natural environment by not introducing too many units too quickly, but enables the balance between economic ambition, housing delivery and protection of the environment to be achieved.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes policies outlining an ambitious growth strategy focussed on economic and infrastructure led approach with a housing requirement above that outlined in the SHMA as well as the Government's standard methodology. The Issues and Options consultation document detailed scenarios based on the evidence available at the time. During the consultation the Government introduced standard methodology figures which have influenced the First Draft Plan.

Consultation responses supported an increase in growth aspirations where these provided the necessary infrastructure and associated opportunities such as economic growth whilst maintaining the protection of the natural, built and historic environment.

The First Draft Plan outlines a growth strategy which provides a balance between the delivery of necessary infrastructure, economic growth and an ambitious housing target. The ambitious housing target is intended to support the delivery of infrastructure but also ensure that the Council guides the future development of communities across the District, by bringing forward developments in a plan led manner through the Local Plan.

Q07 – Do you have evidence to suggest that the housing and/or jobs targets should be different from the forecasts or scenarios outlined above - either higher or lower? (59 responses)

Many of the responses to this question highlighted that the SHMA figures are different from those included within the Government's recent consultation on standardising housing methodology across the country. The Council acknowledge this consultation document and will look to reflect the government figures following the consultation in future documents. Comments from the development industry highlighted the ambitious economic plans that are published by New Anglia LEP and how the housing targets need to reflect these aspirations.

Comments from the local community highlighted the uncertainty surrounding Brexit and how this might have an impact on forecasts and evidence projections in the short to medium term.

Various Town and Parish Councils highlighted local evidence relevant to their community, such as the declining population that was seen from 2001-2011 as well as specific Housing Needs Assessments undertaken on a Parish level.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The Council acknowledges the difference between the SHMA figures and the Government's Standard Methodology figures in the First Draft Plan, but seeks to set an ambitious housing

requirement which is in excess of each of these figures. The ambitious housing target is based on a vision which seeks to promote economic growth and infrastructure delivery alongside residential development across the District.

Any housing requirement is to be viewed as a minimum and therefore it is not appropriate to take a conservative approach as this will not deliver the Council objectives in respect of the economy and infrastructure provision. Issues in respect of Brexit will be kept under review through monitoring and demographic forecasting which will inform future Local Plan Reviews.

Q08 – Would communities be prepared to accept more growth if that growth meant that significant new or enhanced infrastructure could be provided? (59 responses)

A variety of comments to this question which range from respondents supporting the proposal of welcoming growth if infrastructure is provided, to respondents who are clearly against the suggestion. Many of the negative responses outlined that the existing infrastructure is already at capacity or over stretched and therefore not fit for purpose. Introducing more growth into these areas is seen to be worsening the current situation which is not acceptable to the communities that provided responses.

A limited number of responses outlined that their community would be likely to accept further growth but only where particular provision is made in respect of traffic, roads and highways as well as utility and communications services.

Many of the responses were provided by members of the public and Town/Parish Councils. Some responses were received from the development industry or those with land interests but the overwhelming majority of the comments received can from the local community and residents of the area.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan outlines an ambitious housing requirement with the clear intention of significantly boosting the supply of new homes across the District linked to the increased provision of infrastructure to serve the needs of existing and new communities. Site allocations and policies include infrastructure requirements and these are collated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is included within the First Draft Plan.

The provision of Infrastructure across the District is crucial to the success of the First Draft Plan. The Council in partnership with service providers will seek to deliver services and facilities over the plan period through the Community Infrastructure Levy and site specific proposals.

Q09 – What key pieces of transport infrastructure should be sought? Would it be roads such as an Ipswich northern route, or sustainable transport infrastructure (public transport, park and ride, cycling), or both? (62 responses)

The majority of responses to this question supported the proposal for a route to the north of Ipswich to ease the reliance on the Orwell Bridge and the A14. Other common issues identified included the need to improve the public transport opportunities and linkages across the District so that

communities have realistic alternatives to the motor car. Improving the public transport services along with cycle routes can also help improve opportunities across the area.

Some respondents also highlighted the need to direct investment into the rail network to improve the capacity for freight and customer services along the Felixstowe branch and the East Suffolk branch. Improving stations and access to these is seen as a potential way to ease the reliance on the road network.

Key junctions such as the Melton cross roads, Seven Hills and A12/A14 were identified as areas that need improved capacity and respondents highlighted that these are essential to improve the quality of life within the District.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Support for an Ipswich Northern Route has been identified in Chapter 2 of the plan in policy SCLP2.2 and the supporting text. Policy SCLP2.2 also identifies support for improvements to junctions on the A14 and A12 and sustainable transport. Policy SCLP7.1 Sustainable Transport seeks to ensure that infrastructure for cycling and walking is integral to new development.

Q10 – Should the Local Plan Review seek to address the issue of temporary closure of the Orwell Bridge by planning for a scale of development that can help to deliver infrastructure? (36 responses)

The majority of responses to this question were received from members of the public and Town/Parish Councils. Very limited response from the development industry. A mixed response to this question, with some community responses supporting the idea of planning a scale of development to help address the issues of the Orwell Bridge being closed due to bad weather and or accidents. Responses from communities to the east of the Orwell Bridge highlighted that these areas are already suffering from the over reliance and traffic on the A14 and the Orwell Bridge.

Some consultation responses highlighted that authorities should look at opportunities to upgrade and improve the Orwell Bridge as this is seen as a cheaper alternative. Examples of the Queensferry Bridge in Scotland were highlighted.

The majority of consultation responses considered that issues surrounding the bridge were not a reason for a large scale of development to be planned for across the Housing Market Area. Responses highlighted that any closures are generally for a short period and that issues surrounding the bridge and resilience need to be overcome before any further development is planned.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Support for an Ipswich Northern Route has been identified in Chapter 2 of the plan in policy SCLP2.2 and the supporting text. The Council anticipates that the next review of the Local Plan will examine route options in more detail.

Q11 – Do you agree that providing a high growth scenario would help to deliver the affordable housing required? (62 responses)

Many of the responses received from the development industry highlighted that a high growth scenario should be implemented to help deliver the affordable housing required. Developers indicated that a higher housing target will ensure that more affordable housing is delivered across the District. Suggestion that the Council adopts a two tier approach to affordable housing with a lower delivery targeted on smaller sites, balanced against a higher target on larger/strategic sites.

The majority of responses were received from the local community, a mixture of individual residents and Town/Parish Councils. Many of these responses highlighted that it would be inappropriate to target a higher scenario to help deliver affordable housing. A common response was that the Council should enforce policies and requirements more strictly to ensure that affordable housing is delivered on a site and that developers are not given the opportunity to wriggle out of their requirements and leave delivery unfulfilled.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan aims to deliver an ambitious housing requirement which is broadly equivalent to 20% above OAN, the mid-range number proposed in the Issues and Options consultation. Viability testing of Policy SCLP5.10 Affordable Housing on Residential Developments will be undertaken before the Local Plan is finalised, in order that the requirement contained in the final plan is considered viable. However, site specific circumstances may lead to a lower level of provision in individual circumstances.

Q12 – Are there alternative scenarios which should be considered? (34 responses)

A limited number of responses were received to this question with a wide variety of alternative scenarios suggested. Some support for the creation of a new town but this needs to be balanced with the need to conserve and retain the natural environment.

Many of the suggestions focussed on improving infrastructure such as broadband, schools and public transport as well as increasing the number of new build homes and properties that offer smaller types of accommodation which are targeted at younger people or those wishing to downsize later in their life.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Whilst the draft Local Plan does not propose a new town/settlement, it does propose two new Garden Neighbourhoods (at South Saxmundham and North Felixstowe) which provide opportunities for delivery of key infrastructure. The Housing Mix policy (SCLP5.8) sets out requirements to deliver a mix of housing types and sizes and the site allocation policies specify certain types of housing (for example self build or housing for older people) where appropriate to the site and location.

B - Where should the growth go?

Q13 – Which distribution options do you think would be most appropriate to take forward? (172 responses)

A wide variety of responses to this question with many respondents being able to clearly identify a preference (from those given), whilst many others highlighted that there needs to be a blend of the

options presented. Option 4 (continuation of existing strategy) and Option 5 (Focus on Ipswich and A14) were the most popular distribution in terms of number of responses received. However the majority of responses suggested a more refined and varied strategy which takes into account the needs of communities.

There was support for directing more appropriate levels of growth to the rural areas of the District based on the size of the existing settlement. Introducing a distribution which supports growth in the rural areas is seen by many respondents as a way to maintain these communities and support the existing services and facilities. It is also clear from respondents that any distribution needs to ensure settlement coalescence does not occur and that individual communities maintain their identity and distinctiveness.

Many respondents provided suggestions on the distribution based on either the sites they are promoting (such as agents and developers) or the distribution which has the least impact on their community (Parish Council in the north of the District supporting an Ipswich focus distribution). It is also noted that comments received from statutory bodies or service providers such as Anglian Water do not indicate any preference to the distribution at this stage.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan proposes a spatial distribution which is different from those outlined in the Issues and Options document. The options consulted upon were intended to provide distinct alternatives and generate debate to inform future considerations. The consultation responses did not provide a clear preference as the feedback was mixed and in some instances proposed different distributions.

The First Draft Plan proposes a distribution which seeks to direct growth to the rural areas as well as Saxmundham and Felixstowe that seeks to protect the identity of individual communities.

Q14 – Are there any other distribution options that the Councils should consider, including across the whole of the Ipswich Housing Market Area? (37 responses)

A limited number of responses were received to this question but many of the respondents promoted the idea of more growth in the rural areas so that the distribution is more evenly spread across the District. Focusing growth around transport corridors and rail links such as the A12 and A14 was also proposed by some respondents as well as the proposal to build a new community with new infrastructure was also highlighted as an alternative to consider.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a spatial distribution which promotes growth in rural areas as well as Saxmundham and Felixstowe with a focus on the A12 communities. The distribution is considered to spread the development to a larger number of settlements than the current Local Plan.

Q15 – Should the spatial distribution of jobs growth align with housing growth or should we take a different approach which focuses on improving accessibility between homes and work places? (48 responses)

Respondents to this question were mainly from the local community in the form of members of the public and Town/Parish Council. The responses generally highlighted that there needs to be alignment between jobs and housing, but with a focus on main transport corridors and other locations which reduce the need to travel or provide alternatives to the private motor car. Respondents outlined that it is not always achievable to provide jobs and housing in the same location but recognised that this is not always achievable and decision makers need to be realistic but seek to minimise car journeys and safeguard the environment. It is acknowledged in some responses that people tend to commute longer distances based on choice of job and choice of homes which can make it difficult to align job and housing distribution and growth.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan identifies employment allocations well related to the A14 and A12 which reflects consultation responses and market demand evidence published in the Ipswich Economic Area Sector Needs Assessment. The Garden Neighbourhoods at Saxmundham and Felixstowe also require employment provision as part of a comprehensive master plan for these settlements. The provision of employment sites as part of a comprehensive master plan will provide greater economic opportunities across the District in locations well related to communities.

Economic policies in the First Draft Plan also encourage greater flexibility in respect of expansion of existing employment sites to provide more opportunity for economic activity well related to existing communities.

Q16 – Do you have evidence which indicates that building at higher densities in Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal would be viable financially? (23 responses)

The majority of responses to this question highlighted that they did not have any evidence to relate to this issue and therefore provided no comments. Of those that provided comments, it was highlighted that some areas may be able to accommodate higher density development, whilst other areas are unable to do so. Historic England outlined that they have commissioned research to better understand how high density development can be achieved in areas which are rich in heritage and historic assets. The emerging document can form part of the evidence base supporting the Local Plan Review.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

In allocating sites for housing, consideration has been given to the site specific circumstances in determining whether higher densities (than typical densities achieved in the past) may be appropriate. For example, the new Garden Neighbourhoods and larger developments should be able to accommodate high density dwellings such as apartments alongside lower level densities across the development, whereas the character of more rural locations would not suit such high densities.

Q17 – Should the policy approach of maintaining the physical separation of villages from Ipswich be continued or should infill in gaps between settlements be considered a source of housing land? (74 responses)

The overwhelming majority of responses to this question highlighted that the existing policy should be maintained as this is fundamental to ensuring that communities retain individual character, identity and separation. Comments were received from members of the public, Town and Parish Councils who all considered that the separation between communities is essential and land in locations such as these should not be considered as a source of housing land.

Comments received from the development industry echoed the thoughts of the local community, but outlined that the Local Plan needs to be cautious and not just place an arbitrary and overly simplistic approach as this would be harmful and would not protect the most appropriate areas. It is therefore suggested that locations should be considered on a site by site basis with appropriate design influences to ensure that if required suitable locations are brought forward which also recognise the separation between settlements.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan seeks to retain the open and recreational spaces established through previous Local Plans on land between Ipswich and the village of Rushmere. Maintaining this area for a variety of open space and recreational uses ensures separation between Ipswich and Rushmere. The First Draft Plan also includes policies which respect landscape character and separation between settlements throughout the District.

Landscape evidence prepared following the Issues and Options consultation has also informed the First Draft Plan.

Q18 – If development cannot be accommodated within Ipswich, should it be focused within the communities close to Ipswich or distributed within the larger Ipswich Housing Market Area? What criteria should guide its location? (57 responses)

A mixed response to this question with many respondents outlining that if development cannot be accommodated within Ipswich, the growth should be distributed across the rest of the Housing Market Area to sustainable location which have employment opportunities and proximity to public transport.

A equally popular but contrary view was that the growth that cannot be accommodated in Ipswich should then be targeted to locations which are in close proximity to Ipswich to take advantage of existing services and facilities which can support the new and existing communities.

Respondents highlighted that the choice in respect of development needs to be guided by the principles of sustainable development primarily to ensure that appropriate sites come forward in a planned manner. Some respondents outlined that there is no evidence to suggest that Ipswich cannot accommodate its housing requirement and supported the greater provision of high density and high rise developments alongside bringing brownfield/vacant/redundant buildings back into use.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan provides an ambitious housing target which not only seeks to achieve Council objectives and deliver the infrastructure required but it also provides opportunity to provide residential units should Ipswich Borough not be able to meet its own needs. The Council has been working closely with Ipswich during the preparation of the First Draft Plan and have taken the view that any need not met within Ipswich is best distributed across the Housing Market Area. Further details of the partnership working between authorities is outlined in the First Draft Plan and the draft Statement of Common Ground that is being prepared for the Housing Market Area.

The First Draft Plan limits the amount of development proposed for the communities neighbouring Ipswich and instead locates it to areas which are easily accessible through road and rail connections.

The Council will continue to work with Ipswich Borough as their Local Plan progresses.

Q19 – Should Ipswich switch employment land to housing use, even though the Borough has a high jobs target? Where should the Council prioritise protecting employment land? (28 responses)

A mixed response to this question but the majority of respondents highlighted that a cautious approach is needed when considering the switch from employment land to residential use. Many respondents highlighted that Ipswich is a key driver of the local economy and therefore it is essential that enough employment land is retained to support the existing economic activity. Retaining employment land provides opportunities for businesses to be ambitious and realise aspirations without moving away from the area. A particular focus needs to be on those employment sites which are in sustainable locations such as close proximity to public transport and provide opportunities for walking and cycling.

A limited number of responses outlined that the housing need is the most important aspect and through redevelopment and intensification of sites proposed for allocation for employment use, Ipswich may be able to fulfil their housing requirement without taking up any land in Suffolk Coastal (or neighbouring authorities).

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

These comments have been provided to Ipswich Borough who are now undertaking a plan for their administrative area. Original proposals for a joint/aligned Local Plan have now been modified although individual authorities are working towards similar timetables.

Issues in respect of Ipswich Borough will be considered in the Local Plan produced by the Borough Council.

Q20 – Is there other land within Ipswich Borough which should be considered for residential development? Is the approach to protecting open space the right one? (32 responses)

A limited number of responses to this question but the majority outlined that open spaces should be retained and given the relevant protection to maintain a high quality of life and support well-being of residents. The respondents generally agreed that it is vital for parks to be maintained but

suggested that other forms of open space which are redundant or not being used could be suitable for further development if required.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

These comments have been provided to Ipswich Borough who are now undertaking a plan for their administrative area. Original proposals for a joint/aligned Local Plan have now been modified although individual authorities are working towards similar timetables.

Issues in respect of Ipswich Borough will be considered in the Local Plan produced by the Borough Council.

Q21 – Where do you think the most appropriate locations are to meet this need? (31 responses)

A variety of responses to this question with the majority coming from members of the public or Town/Parish Councils. Very limited response from the development industry or those promoting sites as part of the Local Plan process.

In respect of sites for gypsy, travellers and travelling show people – the respondents highlighted that any site needs to be well located and related to existing services and facilities such as schools, public transport and medical provisions. Being in close proximity and in reasonable distance to transport networks is also seen as a key requirement with regards to any future provision. The responses also outlined that provision should be distributed across the District to provide choice and opportunity.

Locations highlighted for boat dwellers were identified as Woodbridge and Felixstowe Ferry to reflect the moorings currently seen as well as other locations on the River Deben and the River Alde. One respondent highlighted that the Orwell is not likely to be a suitable location for houseboats due to the commercial uses which still operate on the Orwell.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

A criteria based policy (SCLP5.17) is proposed which includes a requirement that new sites for Gypsies and Travellers to be well related to a Major Centre, Town, Large Village or Small Village.

Policy SCLP 5.15 relates to houseboats and is accompanied by mapped areas of existing houseboats. These areas were identified in discussion with the Deben Estuary Partnership, through site visits and through analysis of maps. Existing areas of houseboats identified include both Woodbridge and Felixstowe Ferry. Under Policy SCLP 5.15 additional and replacement houseboats will be permitted in these areas.

C - The provision of retail and leisure development

Please also see Town Centres, Retail and Commercial Leisure section

Q22 – Which town centres should we plan to expand? (48 responses)

Improve rather than expand especially Ipswich and Saxmundham Town centres. Don't emulate larger population areas by creating large traditional retail outlets. Support low environmental impact internet based businesses to revitalise Ipswich centre's appeal that is key to addressing retail growth pressure at Martlesham. Address parking, cleanliness, park & ride, seating, toilets and crime in relation to retail facilities. There is a contrast between supermarket provision and broader town centre appeal in Felixstowe and Saxmundham. Leiston can re-organise itself and grow – its present layout and infrastructure does not help it. Perhaps expand Lowestoft or Felixstowe. Change, especially internet shopping and rolling out faster broadband around rural areas is 'dampening down' the need to plan for town centre shopping growth. Instead grow local retail close to new housing and employment development to reduce travel. Infrastructure investment choices can influence and be linked to growth. There are enabling development opportunities to support historic town centre buildings to adapt to changing shopping and leisure habits affecting them. Link large housing developments on town fringes to town centre leisure developments, building refurbishment and environmental improvements.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes minor updates to town centre boundaries, primary and secondary frontages except in Woodbridge because of the older nature of the existing policy. The approach in the First Draft Plan is not to seek to allocate sites for retail growth but to sustain and consolidate concentrations of shops and other main town centre uses in compact existing centres. Policies for new housing sites on the edge of settlements support green infrastructure connections to town and District centres.

Q23 – Are there town centres that should be reduced in size? (21 responses)

Ipswich Town centre was the only one suggested for contraction with one comment saying “it is too straggly with too many empty shops”. Once assets and infrastructure are in place and redundant, convert them for other uses such as housing, offices and recreational functions. Suffolk should not be trying to emulate the larger population areas by creating large traditional retail outlets. Look to move the town centres into the 21st century and supporting more internet based businesses.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan does not allocate specific sites for new retail development. A variety of policies informed by consultation responses have been provided for town centres and employment areas which are informed by the evidence base which seeks to focus on the existing boundaries for town centres.

Comments in relation to Ipswich have been shared with Ipswich Borough Council for consideration within their emerging Local Plan.

Q24 – Which sites should be identified through the Local Plan reviews for future retail growth? (23 responses)

Reconcile demand in the Ipswich – Felixstowe – Woodbridge area with opportunities / constraints to retail / leisure development and town centre growth in this part of the District. Polarised responses on whether retail parks at Ransomes and Martlesham should grow. Consider sites that can enhance linkages, attractiveness and movement between supermarkets and other town centre areas in Saxmundham to serve its hinterland. Consider potential opportunities in Kesgrave (eg: for boutique retail). Reflect market demand and the ‘drive’ (dynamism) of centres in choosing allocation locations.

- Haven Exchange in Felixstowe should be retained for retail and / or leisure use where feasible.
- Derelict sites in Ipswich (eg: old law courts, police station, abandoned shops).
- New unoccupied commercial / employment units in Suffolk Coastal villages and towns. Boutique retail perhaps in Kesgrave, near existing retail areas (by library).
- ALDI have submitted a planning application at Gloster Road, Martlesham Heath, which could provide a discount supermarket in a location currently allocated as employment land.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy approaches support retail uses in Town, District and local centres. They reflect up to date evidence concerning the nature of functional economic relationships (eg: shopping patterns) with Ipswich Town centre (eg: shopping patterns). This First Draft Plan does not introduce any specific site allocations are made for new retail development. This First Draft Local Plan includes a dedicated policy in the retail and town centres section for Martlesham and Kesgrave addresses commercial uses in these areas.

Q25 – How do we increase the range of uses or activities in Ipswich town centre, given its role as a regional centre, and what should they be? (26 responses)

More could be made of the history and heritage of Ipswich. The historic lanes between the waterfront and town centre feel ‘too big’ (*so shared space / imaginative public realm ideas?*). Give it a more upmarket feel and profile by making use of and connections with existing heritage, leisure and cultural assets in the town and surrounding area. For example, complimentary Modern Art Gallery, film hub and sport facilities. Promote green travel, green public spaces, and activities that bring people together and help with the overall health of the population. Particular suggestions include some sort of pedestrian way down to the waterfront. Make the park and rides and cycling more efficient. Make access to the town centre easier for the residents of rural Suffolk. Ease the congestion by building more bridges over the Orwell a northern bypass, more and cheaper car parks. Facilities in Ipswich are too spread out. Discourage out of town retail developments. Ipswich is hard to get into from anywhere other than the surrounding town itself or ‘suburbs’ connecting to the centre. It is a big town, with potential but until real measures are taken to allow easily reliable access, parking etc, the uses and activities provided may not be taken up.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Comments in respect of this question have been shared with Ipswich Borough Council and will inform the emerging Local Plan for Ipswich.

Q26 – What range of uses or activities would you like to see in the smaller town centres? (34 responses)

Appeal to residents and visitors in terms of experience and essentials like a bank and pharmacy. Direct professional service (A2) uses to town centre, local / District centre and edge of centre locations because this diverse service and employment sector is growing whilst traditional banking services provided on the high street are contracting. Saxmundham’s situation presents opportunity for a more accessible leisure centre than the one in Leiston. A choice of commercial leisure venues is required in order to suit different age ranges and cater for diverse preferences. People should not have to routinely leave town to get their entertainment. More public seating and gathering places for entertainments of various kinds are needed. Town centres in Suffolk Coastal are suited to fashion, beauty, art, boutiques, cookery, independent retailers with specialist expertise and products. Town centres should be developed in accordance with their own local character with a strong sense of place and as destinations in their own right. Flexible approaches could help local Town centres be opportunistic in responding to meet the demands of the people living in them, to social and economic trends, signals and encouraging evolving interactions between land uses. Car parking as a key land use is significant and a lack of land for car parking around Framlingham Town centre affects its ability to grow and evolve. There are components of retail provision that are absent from Woodbridge and some other market towns. In particular, provision needs to be made for discount food stores. Towns need to not just provide the daily basics, but encourage visiting, such as having ample parking, and be pleasant to walk around.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The consultation responses highlighted the variety of uses that are to be encouraged within town centres across the District. The First Draft Plan includes policies for town centres that support a concentration of a broader range of leisure, cultural and social uses in town centres. Town Centre policies specifically address town centre environments including encouraging people to spending time in them and supporting inclusive accessibility to, from and around them.

Q27 – What approach should be taken to further out of centre shopping? Does out of centre shopping complement or compete with the existing town centres? (45 responses)

Out of town shopping can undermine local smaller scale enterprises but there are significant distances between Martlesham and some Suffolk Coastal market towns. The choice context for leisure like swimming or a sporting activity may affect people without a car more in locations with a lack of daytime and evening public transport. It may be unrealistic to accommodate bulky goods retail in town centres due to distance between shops and car parking.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a retail hierarchy which will help guide future considerations in respect of uses to be encouraged within existing town centres and how these are balanced with out of centre shopping / retail parks. The First Draft Plan provides a policy approach with reflects the role of out of centre retail at Martlesham and supports commercial leisure uses in the town centres

across the District.

Q28 – Should the existing retail parks be considered in their own right, or should town centres continue to be the first choice location for new shops and leisure uses? (44 responses)

Town centres should be the first choice for new shops and leisure uses. Embrace the established function of Martlesham and plan positively in accordance with the NPPF by making site allocations for new retail provision. Differences between out of town retail parks and town centres means policy need to be very careful not to be detrimental to either of them. Need policy approaches for distinct established retail destinations, both town centre and out of town. Vacant units at retail parks may be unsuitable for change of use to leisure. Use vacant larger stores in town and out of town for indoor markets. Separation of retail showroom, storage and collection premises presents opportunity for bulky goods customer collection in accessible community hub locations in town and out of town.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan provides policy approaches for distinct town centres and established retail destinations reflect the established function of out of centre retail at Martlesham and its differences with town centres. No specific allocations are made for new retail development reflecting particularly modest requirements for additional retail floorspace in the District and retail relationships with Ipswich Borough.

D – Infrastructure

Q29 – What infrastructure is currently required in your area and what additional infrastructure do you think would be needed, and where, to support the future distribution and levels of growth outlined? (124 responses)

Many of the respondents to this question identified issues which relate to their individual communities. The general consensus is that the existing provision of infrastructure across the District is inadequate and unable to cope with any further development/growth. Common issues that have been identified include schools, medical facilities, broadband and mobile coverage, public transport, water supply and water sewerage.

Alongside the responses which called for improved public transport, respondents highlighted the inadequate provision of cycle lanes and facilities in the District which makes it difficult to link new and existing developments and provide sustainable alternatives to the private motor car.

Comments from service providers focussed on particular areas such as ensuring that all sites will require connections to the existing water supply and that development in certain parts of the District, such as Saxmundham will require a new primary school to be provided alongside any future development. Issues were also raised in respect of access requirements at the Household Waste Recycling Facilities, libraries and fire sprinkler systems which may be provided alongside future developments.

A large number of responses highlighted the need for significant improvements to the road network in the form of the Ipswich Northern Route, Wet Dock Crossing and the four villages bypass on the A12. These large scale projects are considered by many to be essential to “opening” up the areas and improving the flow of traffic across the District. Responses which supported these type of developments were received from members of public, Town/Parish Councils as well as the development industry.

In a few instances, respondents highlighted that the infrastructure in their community (such as schools) were adequate but needed further growth to come forward to ensure the viability of these facilities.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan places great emphasis on the need for infrastructure as fundamental to the delivery of healthy communities across the District. The provision of infrastructure is acknowledged throughout and where a need has been identified site specific policies require the delivery of this infrastructure.

To highlight the importance of infrastructure as part of the First Draft Plan policies have been included which demonstrate the need for cross boundary infrastructure as well as a policy for the provision of infrastructure in Suffolk Coastal. An Infrastructure Delivery Framework has also been provided in the First Draft Plan to capture the infrastructure need across the District which has been informed by consultation responses and further engagement with service providers.

Throughout the plan period, the Council will continue to work with local communities, landowners, developers and infrastructure providers to ensure infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner across the District.

Q30 – How can the strategic transport connections be enhanced and improved? (44 responses)

In response to this question, some respondents identified various road junctions and “pinch points” in the existing network such as the Severn Hills roundabout, single carriageway sections of the A12 north of Ipswich and locations such as the Melton crossroads or traffic speeds on the B1116 in Hacheston.

A large number of respondents made specific reference to the provision of public transport services across the District which will provide viable alternatives to the private motor car. Improving the rail services through either dualling the lines or more regular services is seen as a positive step which will improve the sustainability of the area. Specific improvements to the passenger service at Saxmundham could include extending the branch line to also serve the communities of Leiston and Aldeburgh. Improvements to the rail lines would also help increase the capacity for freight movements associated with the Port of Felixstowe, however Network Rail has referenced that they are undertaking work to look at closing level crossings across the District which is likely to have an impact on associated communities.

The Local Plan should also consider ways of working with public transport service providers to ensure greater consistency and relationship between bus and rail services so that individuals can

make use of both services where appropriate, as opposed to the timetables being out of time with one another. Alongside this, the suggestion of subsidising fares to make public transport more cost effective was mooted.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses have highlighted the need to make further improvements to transport infrastructure over the plan period. The First Draft Plan identifies large scale development on key transport corridors and promotes links between road and rail provision.

Over the plan period, the Council will continue to engage with service providers to encourage greater capacity in strategic transport infrastructure which will bring positive opportunities to the District.

Where specific issues have been identified these have informed considerations and if relevant included within the First Draft Plan as policy requirements or within the Infrastructure Delivery Framework.

Q31 – In which areas should "super surgeries" be considered? (37 responses)

A limited number of responses to this question and all received from members of the public and Town/Parish Councils. These responses suggested that urban locations such as Ipswich, Kesgrave and Felixstowe were suitable as well as market towns and Key Service Centres. A fairly broad spread of suggestions across the District but generally these highlighted locations which are sustainable and accessible.

Some of the consultation responses highlighted that the location of medical facilities ought to be spread across the District in accessible locations. If facilities are not provided in accessible locations this may lead to rural and social isolation. Medical facilities can also provide further uses such as pharmacy, physiotherapy and other support and community provision which is of benefit to the wider community.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan does not identify any "super surgeries". Where consultation responses have highlighted a need for further medical provision, the First Draft Plan includes a policy requirement to this. Over the plan period, the Council will continue to work with service providers to ensure that appropriate medical facilities are brought forward (either through the Community Infrastructure Levy or provision by medical providers) in a timely manner.

Q32 – Is there a need for additional education provision in certain areas of the Housing Market Area, including early years and special educational facilities, and if so what is the need and where? (37 responses)

The majority of responses to this question were provided by members of the public and Town/Parish Councils who have provided local information in respect of schools within their area.

Respondents identified capacity issues at Kesgrave and Farlingaye High Schools which needs to be addressed. Capacity at Felixstowe capacity will need to be considered alongside any further development that may come forward as part of the Local Plan Review.

A number of primary schools were identified as having capacity issues such as Trimley St Martin, Easton, Kesgrave, Kelsale and Saxmundham. It is also acknowledged by Saxmundham Town Council and the limited response from the development industry that any future growth in Saxmundham will need to provide a new primary school to address the capacity needs in this part of the District. Kelsale Parish Council also echoed this concern.

Most responses were focussed on primary and secondary school provision but some respondents highlighted that Leiston would benefit from sixth form provision and that each town should be able to provide education from nursery age to sixth form age. It was also acknowledged that nursery provision provides opportunity for parents to remain economically active and that the Local Plan should ensure appropriate early years provision is made.

Suffolk County Council included within their consultation response the pupil forecasts for all schools across the District so the capacity at each can be taken into account when considering future options and strategies.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes allocations which require the provision of a primary school as Felixstowe, Saxmundham and Trimley St Mary. Additional allocations at Eyke and Dennington also provide potential for increased car parking associated with schools as identified through the consultation responses.

Suffolk County Council have been involved with site allocations and identified the need for additional provision which can be delivered through the Local Plan.

Q33 – What kind of outdoor recreational spaces would you like and where should we locate them to reduce pressure on the more sensitive coastal areas? What other measures could be put in place to protect sensitive environments? (56 responses)

Respondents to this question were in general agreement that there is a need for a variety of outdoor recreational spaces across the District. These recreational spaces provide opportunity for people in areas close to where they live as well as reducing the visitor pressure on the sensitive locations and sites across the District.

A range of spaces such as footpaths, informal spaces, sport and leisure facilities were highlighted as potential types of infrastructure that could be introduced alongside future development to serve the needs of the new communities as well as complementing the existing provision.

Comments from statutory consultees such as Suffolk Wildlife Trust and RSPB highlighted support for the introduction of the “Green Rim” around Ipswich, as this is seen to complement the mitigation being introduced through the RAMS (Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy) project as well

as providing high quality spaces for the local communities to enjoy and contribute towards improved health and well being.

Throughout the responses it is noted that most highlight the need for outdoor recreational spaces to be provided alongside new development and most significantly this needs to be planned as an integral part of the design to ensure it is useable and effective. Respondents outlined that recreational spaces should be part of the development with ample green paths and cycle ways to access neighbouring areas/settlements and facilities as these provide local opportunities but also help preserve the more sensitive landscapes in the area.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan has been informed by consultation responses. A strategic policy on the provision of open space is included alongside site specific allocations which require provision of open space, recreational facilities and enhancements to open space. Where necessary the provision of green infrastructure has been included within site allocations as well as the Garden Neighbourhoods at Felixstowe and Saxmundham.

The provision of open space and recreational facilities will be monitored throughout the plan period and where relevant included within the Infrastructure Delivery Framework.

Issues in respect of Ipswich Borough such as the Ipswich Green Rim will be considered in the Local Plan produced by the Borough Council.

Part 2

Vision

Q34 – What makes a successful community in Suffolk Coastal (51 responses)

A sustainable and balanced community is one that attracts and provides for all ages and a variety of backgrounds, with schools, shops, medical facilities, accessible meeting places, employment, open spaces and recreational facilities. Successful communities evolve over time through diversity and development which is successfully managed. A mix of generations and diverse facilities, supported by green infrastructure and attractive environments helps to make a community successful.

Across the District there is a need to maintain a variety of communities to provide choice of environment and location for residents. It is also important that residents have a stake in their community and environment. This can be achieved through good community spirit and engagement in community decisions and social opportunities.

Successful communities are a balance of social, economic and environmental factors and the historic environment often contributes to attractive and safe places to live and work. Suffolk Coastal has an abundance of heritage assets and historic places which helps to promote successful communities.

Consultation responses also highlighted that the residents and businesses which operate and live within a community make the area successful. However it is acknowledged that all communities across the District are unique and “success” is measured in different ways in different settlements.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a vision for the District up to 2036. This vision has been influenced by the consultation responses and recognises that communities across the District are unique and have a diverse attraction which is to be retained over the plan period.

Each community is successful in its own right and each can be measured in a variety of ways. At the heart of each community is the local population and the community facilities and services available to them. The First Draft Plan recognises the variety of communities across the District and includes a range of policies which can be applied to any area of the District. Policies to retain community facilities and services, as well as employment opportunities are included within the First Draft Plan to help maintain successful communities across the District.

Q35 – What services/facilities/developments are needed to make a community successful? (47 responses)

Consultation responses identified that facilities such as cafes, shops, markets, play areas, public houses, village halls, footpaths and cycleways, places for social interaction and residential

accommodation which meets the needs of all generations. Improving the capacity of services and facilities, alongside opportunities for informal (natural open space and areas for dog walking) and formal leisure activities is of great benefit to communities.

Numerous respondents highlighted that a good range of residential and employment opportunities are necessary for a successful community. It is also noted that some respondents acknowledged the neighbouring settlements provide infrastructure to maintain basic needs which in turn supports the facility in the nearby and (often larger settlement).

A need for reliable high speed broadband and enhanced digital infrastructure is required to support a successful community and enable residents to access facilities which are being provided on-line.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses identified a variety of services and facilities which are needed to make a community successful. The First Draft Plan includes policies which seek to protect these services and facilities to encourage the continued success of communities across the District.

The First Draft Plan also includes a policy in respect of digital infrastructure to support the continued upgrade of these facilities over the plan period. In some locations, the provision for digital infrastructure is poor and impacts on the quality of life of residents and visitors to the area. Consultation responses have highlighted the need to be proactive in addressing these issues.

Q36 – What is your vision for your local community? (60 responses)

A positive vision for the local community is important and will help to develop a sense of community and provide additional services and facilities to support the existing residents. Supported by improvements to schooling, medical facilities and public transport including maintenance of the roads. Being able to access the existing range of services and facilities was a common response.

Consultation responses highlighted the need for more affordable housing, as well as bungalows and properties targeted at elderly residents who wish to downsize and stay in their village. Improvements to digital and mobile services are also included within the responses to this question. These improvements will enable more residents to access facilities on line and improve their quality of life.

Some consultation responses received from Town/Parish Councils provided detailed visions for their communities which take into account the specific geographical and natural features of the community, relationship to neighbouring settlements. Each of these should share an ongoing sense of place, heritage and environment based on individual identity and character – which may include maintaining the physical separation between neighbouring communities.

Consultation responses highlighted the need to protect the countryside and natural environment of the District. The need to protect the environment is to be balanced against the needs of residents and businesses and the demands placed on facilities. The amount of second homes that are coming forward in the District needs to be carefully controlled and discouraged so that houses in the District

are “lived in” rather than “occupied”. Future housing should be confined to that needed by permanent residents.

Communities undertaking Neighbourhood Plans outlined that visions for settlements are being evolved or have already been established through “made” Neighbourhood Plans.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes specific visions for settlements which are at the top of the settlement hierarchy. These visions are supported by area specific policies and site allocations which have been influenced by consultation responses.

Issues raised by consultation responses have been incorporated into site allocations and District wide planning policies. Residential allocations include policy requirements to target accommodation at the needs of the ageing population or younger people as opposed to properties which are attractive to second home owners. Policies in respect of protection for community facilities and local shopping opportunities are included within the First Draft Plan along with the intention to resist settlement coalescence. Resisting settlement coalescence will also ensure that the identities of individual communities is maintained over the plan period as outlined by consultation responses.

The First Draft Plan also includes guidance on the relationship between the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans to inform future evolution and production of plans by local communities.

Q37 – How should the Council define housing requirement figures for Neighbourhood Plan groups? (42 responses)

Defining the housing requirements for communities undertaking Neighbourhood Plans will be crucial and should take into account the sustainable location of the village. The number of units to be provided in Neighbourhood Plans should relate to the current size of the community and the opportunities afforded to it by the current distribution and strategy.

Where housing requirements are identified in the Local Plan, these should be informed by engagement with the local community and Neighbourhood Plan groups. These discussions can be informed by Housing Needs Assessments that are undertaken during the plan preparation periods.

Consultation responses highlighted that Neighbourhood Plans are regarded as expensive and time consuming and offer no real value. Placing a housing requirement would be seen as a burden for some small communities and the top down approach is inappropriate.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes an indicative housing requirement for those communities who are already committed to undertaking a Neighbourhood Plan. These indicative figures are informed by the emerging spatial strategy and distribution of housing as well as potential opportunities for site allocations within these communities. The indicative numbers will be subject to public consultation and engagement as the plan evolves to the Final Draft Plan stage.

The Council is required to include indicative housing requirements for Neighbourhood Plans within its Local Plan.

Housing

Q38 – Are the existing policy approaches and planning policies operating appropriately in relation to affordable housing? (74 responses)

General consensus is that the existing policy approaches are not working and that the Local Plan should do more to ensure that more affordable units are provided and that developers do not “wriggle” out of the delivery of affordable housing on grounds on viability. Need to ensure that units proposed as affordable are actually delivered to meet the needs of the local population. Suggestion for the need to deliver Council houses to ensure that low cost units are provided which provide residential opportunities for those most at need in the District. Consultation responses suggested that developers should be encouraged to provide affordable units early in the development of a site.

Concern from some Parish Councils that the national changes to the threshold for affordable provision have changed and suggestion that the SCDC Local Plan Review needs to introduce a lower locally set threshold. On the contrary some developers and the Home Builders Federation highlight the need to ensure that the affordable housing policy and threshold are revised to be in conformity with the national planning practice guidance.

Important to recognise that the local area is popular with tourists and second homes which takes residential units out of the housing stock. Need to balance the needs of the local population with the economic benefits of tourism. It would be inappropriate to direct affordable housing units to some areas of high house prices which are dominated by second homes such as coastal settlements.

Accessibility to services and facilities was highlighted as a factor in respect of affordable housing. Some consultation responses suggested that affordable housing delivery should be targeted to towns or areas with services and facilities to support those on lower incomes.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Setting an ambitious housing target above the number arising through the new standard method approach will help to deliver more affordable homes.

Viability testing of Policy SCLP5.10 Affordable Housing on Residential Developments will be undertaken before the Local Plan is finalised, in order that the requirement contained in the final plan is considered viable. However, site specific circumstances may lead to a lower level of provision in individual circumstances.

The NPPF enables local authorities to set a lower threshold for affordable housing requirements and to obtain contributions from these developments in the form of commuted sums. Policy SCLP5.10 includes support for Neighbourhood Plans setting their own local policies for affordable housing provision where this is justified by evidence.

As they make up a significant proportion of the planned housing growth, the developments of Garden Neighbourhoods in the towns of Saxmundham and Felixstowe should provide significant amounts of new affordable housing, subject to viability testing.

Q39 – Is the existing affordable housing policy coverage and scope sufficient? Do you have any suggestions for what else might be included in a comprehensive approach to affordable housing? (64 responses)

The majority of respondents indicated that the existing policies are not working appropriately and that the level of affordable housing being provided is not meeting the local needs. Future local plan policies need to be more proactive in encouraging developments to come forward which provide small residential units targeted at the young and the elderly. Policies should be flexible and recognise that different models can provide affordable housing which will increase opportunities. Modern construction techniques such as factory/modular build and the identification of self build can help to ensure that land is allocated for units which are truly affordable.

Numerous suggestions for the council to take the lead in the provision of affordable housing through developing Council houses or community land trusts which can ensure new units are affordable to the local community. The use of covenants to keep units small and restricting sale prices will help to maintain the number of affordable units in the District.

Concern raised that the affordable units built are not being taken up by people locally and often being made available to people outside of the District.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Setting an ambitious housing target above the number arising through the new standard method approach will help to deliver more affordable homes.

Policy SCLP5.8 Housing Mix requires a mix of housing on sites reflecting the SHMA and also requires a proportion to be accessible and adaptable dwellings under Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. Where there are specific opportunities for specific types of housing associated with proposed site allocations, such as housing to meet the needs of older people or self build plots this is specified within these policies.

The East Suffolk housing Strategy shows how the Council intends to support the delivery of more affordable houses through its other functions as well as planning. Policy SCLP5.11 Affordable Housing on Exception Sites requires an identified local need to be demonstrated.

Q40 – Where provision for affordable housing on an 'exception site' is supported by, and can be shown to meet the needs of, that local community should planning policy be sufficiently flexible to allow for this? (55 responses)

The majority of responses (from Town/Parish Councils) said yes to this question. Each highlighted that the needs of the local community need to be clearly identified and that future Planning Policies need to be flexible enough to accommodate this. A number of responses did not favour this approach as they consider that the development of an exception site may set an unwelcome precedent and therefore be detrimental to the future of the community.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP5.11 supports the provision of affordable housing in the countryside on Exception Sites

where these meet an identified local need is included. The policy reflects the National planning Policy Framework.

Q41 – Should we continue to allow market housing to enable the delivery of affordable housing where the financial viability of a development is challenging? (63 responses)

Mixed response to this question. The majority of Parish Councils who commented on this question supported the need to allow market housing to ensure the delivery of affordable housing where viability is challenging. There is clear acknowledgement that market housing should be allowed to cross subsidise the provision of affordable housing but only where this is targeted at meeting the needs of the local community. Agents, developers and consultants highlighted the government’s position which supports this cross subsidy.

Strong concern from members of the public that the Council should challenge the developers more on viability. General theme suggests that the council is not strong enough in respect of viability considerations and that planning policies need to be made more rigorous to ensure that it is much harder for viability arguments to be made by developers.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Recognising the comments received, Policy SCLP5.11 would only support a proportion of market housing where it is demonstrated through a viability assessment that the market housing is needed for the affordable housing to be deliverable. The policy requires the market housing to be no more than one third of the dwellings.

Q42 – Do you consider it appropriate for the Council to consider directing growth to a cluster of villages? (71 responses)

A mixture of response to this question with many respondents saying that it would only be considered appropriate for the Council to direct growth to a cluster of villages if each village can maintain its identity and avoid coalescence of settlements.

It is noted that some of the “urban” communities have suggested that the Council should encourage this approach as it will help to spread the requirements across more areas, this view however is counter balanced by the “rural” communities who do not welcome the cluster approach.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP10.4 seeks to avoid the coalescence of settlements. The approach to site allocations has considered each settlement on its own merits rather than taking a clusters approach, however the methodology for the settlement hierarchy has considered whether a settlement is within 1km or within 1km-5km of a Major Centre or Market Town.

Q43 – What criteria should be used to identify a cluster of villages? (36 responses)

Strong objection to the principal of clusters as many respondents consider it necessary to ensure individual identity of each community is maintained and that settlement coalescence is not

encouraged. Concern that clustering may lead to inappropriate levels of development being forced upon settlements that do not wish to grow and become larger.

There was acknowledgement from some respondents that clustering should be based on services which are accessible for the community and serve a variety of settlements and provide services such as medical facilities, schools, shops and other services that provide alternatives to the market towns or larger areas. Concern from some respondents that villages may be clustered around market towns which provide all the services and therefore of no benefit to the rural communities which need support for their facilities.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP10.4 seeks to avoid the coalescence of settlements. The approach to site allocations has considered each settlement on its own merits rather than taking a clusters approach, however the methodology for the settlement hierarchy has considered whether a settlement is within 1km or within 1km-5km of a Major Centre or Market Town.

Q44 – How can the Council encourage the provision of fully serviced building plots for self build / custom build properties? (30 responses)

The majority of responses from members of the public and the local community supported the provision of self/custom build plots across the District as part of development sites. Many of the responses outlined that parts of sites should be set aside for the provision of serviced plots to provide opportunity for self/custom build units to come forward. It was acknowledged that the landowner needs to see an appropriate return/income for the provision of such sites. However caution was raised in respect of self build properties being exempt from CIL charges and the concern that a large number of units delivered in this way will have a detrimental impact on the existing infrastructure.

Comments from the development industry have highlighted that the lack of identified plots is the biggest reason why self/custom build properties are not being delivered. It was also highlighted that it would be inappropriate to have a target for the number of self/custom builds as part of the wider housing target.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP5.9 requires developments of 100 or more dwellings to provide a minimum of 5% of plots for self build. However, the policy also provides for these to be developed by the developer if the plots are not taken up within 12 months. No overall target for self build plots is set.

Q45 – Should these serviced plots be provided as part of a larger housing development? (37 responses)

The proposal to include serviced plots as part of a larger housing development is welcomed by many of the respondents, with comments suggesting that this is becoming common practice on larger sites and a way of providing more affordable type units which provide alternative accommodation to the normal units delivered. Concern was raised from land promoters/developers that the provision of

self build plots on larger development sites may only serve part of the demand across the District, as many self builders do not wish to take up sites within these type of developments.

It is interesting that rural Parishes have answered this question negatively and outline that it would not be appropriate, this may be down to the size of potential developments expected within the rural communities. The Local Plan Review needs to acknowledge that self build plots are only one part of the overall delivery across the District and although they can provide reasonable alternatives, these sites must be identified in appropriate locations which reflect the circumstances of any particular site.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP5.9 requires developments of 100 or more dwellings to provide a minimum of 5% of plots for self build. However, the policy also provides for these to be developed by the developer if the plots are not taken up within 12 months, which would respond to any issues around lack of demand.

Q46 – Should we continue with the current policy approach to housing size or take a more flexible approach that reflects the site location and characteristics? (60 responses)

General support for a more flexible policy approach to housing mix but with clear indication that any development needs to take account of the surrounding character, location and distinctiveness. Consultation responses from the local community have highlighted the need to provide different housing options for different sectors of the community such as young people, older people and those wishing to downsize. But these units still need to take account of the location and character of the site.

Responses from the development industry have highlighted that any policy needs to provide clarity for applicants. It has however also been suggested that the policy should introduce a threshold above which the council can be more prescriptive about the mix required. On smaller sites (under 10), the council should not implement the policy in respect of mix. Consultation responses also highlighted that there is often a mismatch between the needs identified in the SHMA and the actual demands of the housing market.

Suggestion that the current policy is working appropriately but responses encouraged the Council to ensure that the needs of the local community are listened to in accordance with guidance from the local Parish and Town Councils. Important to ensure that housing size is reflected by the level of amenities available in the area and developments provide inclusive communities for all.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The Housing Mix policy (SCLP5.8) seeks to provide a greater mix of housing types, including more choice for older people. Policy SCLP5.8 does also provide an opportunity for mix to reflect locally identified needs where this is supported by evidence, such as where a Parish needs survey has been undertaken although it must be recognised that developments are contributing to the District wide need. Through the process of selecting preferred sites for allocation, consideration has been given to whether a site would offer particular opportunities to provide for a certain type of housing such as that which meets the needs of older people, and this is reflected in the site allocations policies.

Q47 – How can the Local Plan promote an increase in smaller units to meet specific needs? (37 responses)

General support from members of the public and Town/Parish Councils to identify sites for smaller units or propose sites for higher density developments. The delivery of smaller units is dependent on the specific needs of the local community and the need to provide accommodation for older people and younger people. Council encouraged to follow the result of the SHMA in respect of housing need and not be driven by the housing market. Local Plan policies should also encourage the delivery of flats and/or Almhouse type developments which will provide alternative choices of accommodation across the District.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP5.8 Housing Mix requires the provision of a range of types of housing, and the supporting text refers to a range of different types of housing including Almshouses. The policies for the housing site allocations include reference to specific types of housing that should be provided, such as that for older people, where appropriate to the characteristics and location of the site.

Q48 – What more could be done to help ensure that more housing is provided specifically to meet the needs of older people, or those with specialist care needs? (42 responses)

Clear indication from the consultation responses that the Local Plan needs to ensure that housing provision is appropriate for the ageing population which is growing rapidly. The increased provision of units targeted at certain parts of society (young, elderly, singles) will help ensure vibrant and inclusive communities. Encouraging more smaller units will enable downsizing opportunities which in turn will make more family style housing available.

A specific policy is required for the provision of specialist accommodation for older people which takes into account the variety of requirements from independent living to care provision. By properly planning for the housing needs of the ageing population it will ensure that land is used efficiently and that demands on the NHS and Social Services are reduced as residents will benefit from accommodation which meets their needs.

Acknowledgement from some consultation responses that the ageing population will make different choices and that not everybody wants to live in specialist accommodation but do want to remain in their own homes. Important to provide a range and choice of accommodation across the District which may include retirement communities as seen in America as well as developments to cater for the needs of those with dementia or other conditions.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP5.8 includes support for sheltered and extra care housing where this will meet identified needs. The policy also requires a mix of housing to be provided and requires proposals to demonstrate how they contribute towards increasing the choice and mix of housing available for older people.

Q49 – Should starter homes be part of the type and mix of units required? (49 responses)

The majority of the responses clearly indicated that the Council should include starter homes as part of the overall mix expected on sites that come forward. Many Town and Parish Councils as well as members of the public highlighted their support for this proposal. Concern was raised by some agents though that the government’s definition of starter homes is still being clarified and the emerging Local Plan needs to be aware of this and incorporate any conclusions within future policies.

A small minority of the responses highlighted that starter homes were not needed are part of the overall mix because there are already sufficient units in the District. Some respondents also highlighted the need for “final” homes to balance the provision for “starter”.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework would bring Starter Homes within the definition of affordable housing and therefore they would be delivered through the affordable housing policies either on Exception Sites or as part of market housing development.

Q50 – Should the Council encourage greater use of modular construction to provide a range of residential accommodation? (41 responses)

The majority of the consultation responses supported the encouragement of modular construction techniques across the District, on the understanding that these are sympathetic to the setting of the existing buildings and community. Concern was raised from the development industry that the Local Plan is not the place to dictate the building methods, that is for the Building Regulation stage, but the Local Plan can introduce policies which encourage the delivery of modular properties, especially when these can provide suitable homes at a cheaper price.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Modular construction is referred to in the supporting text to the self-build policy SCLP5.9 as one possible means of self building. It is not considered appropriate to specify modular construction, but it is recognised that this could contribute to housing mix.

Q51 – Should specialist housing be delivered on specific sites or alongside other forms of residential development? (35 responses)

The majority of the consultation responses acknowledged that providing specialist housing is an important part of the overall residential provision across the District. Many of the respondents suggested that this type of accommodation should be delivered alongside and integrated with other forms of accommodation. The wider community benefits from the integration of residential units where these are well related to the neighbouring community and take account of the surrounding environment. A small number of responses indicated that it would be preferable to locate specialist housing on specific sites which are separate from the rest of the community.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP5.8 seeks to ensure a mix of housing on sites, and requires that proposals of 10 or more units will need to demonstrate how the proposal contributes to increasing choice and mix of housing

available for the older population.

Q52 – Are there any other specific types of residential use that need to be planned for? (26 responses)

Consultation responses highlighted a need for Planning Policies to provide for a wide range of accommodation across the District. Examples include mobile homes, bungalows, accommodation for an ageing population and retirement communities.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP5.8 Housing Mix requires a mix of housing types to be provided and requires that proposals of 10 or more units will need to demonstrate how the proposal contributes to increasing choice and mix of housing available for the older population. The approach to site allocations has included identifying specific opportunities for housing that would help to meet the needs of older people as part of site allocation policies.

Q53 – The District contains a small number of houseboats. Existing planning policies limit the areas within which houseboats are permitted and the number of houseboats within those areas. Do you think this type of approach remains appropriate? (31 responses)

General support for the provision of houseboats as these provide alternative forms of residential accommodation as well as being attractive part of the rivers and surrounding landscape. Consultation responses supported the existing policies but suggested that these need to be amended with positive enforcement from the Planning Department. Policy on houseboats should be expanded to include a local definition in respect of a functioning house boat which can move from site to site and floating homes which are not capable of moving.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP 5.15 relates to houseboats and is accompanied by mapped areas of existing houseboats. These areas were identified in discussion with the Deben Estuary Partnership, through site visits and through analysis of maps. Under this policy additional and replacement houseboats will be permitted in these areas.

The First Draft Local Plan also provides a local definition of a houseboat which describes a floating decked structure without a permanent foundation which is designed or adapted for use as a residence and not primarily used for navigation. This does allow for houseboats that are navigable, to an extent.

Q54 – Should the physical limits boundaries be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely defined to allow for small scale development in communities? (113 responses)

The majority of responses highlighted the need to retain the settlement boundary as these provide a clearly defined boundary which provides some certainty for the local community. Many respondents from local residents and or Town/Parish Councils supported the intention to retain these boundaries and that they should be tightly drawn, defined and defended. Consultation responses acknowledged the role that settlement boundaries play in defending the countryside and

other such locations which may be subject to speculative applications – they also serve as a way of ensuring settlement coalescence is resisted.

Very limited support for the introduction of a criteria based policy because this will lead to less certainty for the local community and make things looser which will lead to infringements in some cases.

Some comments from the development industry sought the requirements that boundaries should be drawn loosely as this will provide greater opportunity to encourage small scale development within the defined boundary. Suggestions also that the Council should consider introducing a criteria based approach which sets out the conditions that allow for extensions to the boundaries.

The consultation responses highlighted a strong difference of opinion between the development industry and the local communities in respect of physical limit boundaries across the District.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP3.4 retains settlement boundaries, and the boundaries themselves have been updated to reflect planning permissions for residential use granted up to 31.3.18. This approach to retaining settlement boundaries should be considered alongside the policies for the countryside including Policy SCLP5.4 Housing in Clusters under which proposals for up to three dwellings would be supported in clusters of five or more dwellings, and proposals for up to five dwellings in clusters of up to ten dwellings, providing opportunities for small scale growth outside of settlement boundaries.

Q55 – Can criteria based policies more appropriately deal with growth in the rural areas than physical limits boundaries? (81 responses)

The majority of the respondents to the question were from members of the public who indicated that the introduction of a criteria based policy is not appropriate when dealing with levels of growth. Concern from many members of the public that implementing a criteria based policy would lead to “open season” in respect of developments which would not be acceptable.

It is acknowledged in the consultation responses that a criteria based policy would be difficult to interpret and enforce when compared to a physical limits boundary which should be enforced consistently and regularly.

Opposite views were generally received from the development industry or agents acting on behalf of potential sites. Comments supported the loosening of the boundaries to allow for more flexibility and growth inside the boundary. In some locations it has been suggested that increasing the amount of land within the boundary would be a more proportionate way of ensuring growth can come forward in appropriate locations.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

As with the response to Q54 above, policy SCLP3.4 retains settlement boundaries, and the boundaries themselves have been updated to reflect planning permissions for residential use granted up to 31.3.18. This approach to retaining settlement boundaries should be considered alongside the policies for the countryside including Policy SCLP5.4 Housing in Clusters under which

proposals for up to three dwellings would be supported in clusters of five or more dwellings, and proposals for up to five dwellings in clusters of up to ten dwellings, providing opportunities for small scale growth outside of settlement boundaries.

Q56 – Do all settlements require physical limits boundaries? (75 responses)

The majority of consultation responses highlighted the need for settlements to have a physical limits boundary, although in many instances this was justified by commentary relating to the clarity that a boundary provides and that a boundary would stop communities blending into one another. Within the support for the boundaries, it is noted that some respondents said that boundaries are only needed for sustainable locations where growth is expected and it would be inappropriate for all settlements to have a boundary reinstated.

Comments were mainly from the Town/Parish Councils or members of the public, but on occasions the development industry provided comments which suggested that not all settlements are sustainable and therefore question the need to introduce physical limit boundaries in the most sustainable settlements.

A limited number of responses gave a simple answer of no to this question but in the main there was generally a positive response to this question and the need to provide physical limit boundaries in sustainable locations.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Settlement boundaries are applied or retained to all Major Centres, Market Towns, Large Villages and Small Villages. Settlements in the countryside do not have settlement boundaries as the countryside policies would apply. It is not considered to appropriate to not apply settlement boundaries as the boundaries provide a degree of certainty for communities.

Q57 – Do you think the current policy approach to development in housing clusters is working successfully or does it need to be amended? (33 responses)

The general nature of the responses was one of support from many Town and Parish Councils who consider that the cluster policy is generally working appropriately across the District. Some communities highlight that a cluster should be no more than 5 units, where as others indicated that it should be over 5 units so there was a mixture of opinions as to what constitutes a cluster.

Comments from members of the public highlighted the need to ensure that a cluster is more clearly defined but that the current approach is appropriate to deliver additional housing whilst avoiding coalescence and environmental impact.

Limited comments from the development industry/agents but these tended to highlight the need for the cluster policy to be more flexible or expanded to reflect the local conditions and the dependency within the rural areas on the private motor car.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Reflecting the strategy for the Local Plan to facilitate growth in the rural areas, Policy SCLP5.4 Housing in Clusters in the Countryside provides greater scope for development than is contained in

the current policy DM4 in the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2013). The definition of a cluster is set out in the policy and is described in the supporting text.

Q58 – How should the Council consider applications for the re-use of redundant buildings in the countryside? (49 responses)

A mixed response to this question but comments generally favoured the re-use of existing buildings but with flexible policies to ensure that these can be renovated for a mixture of residential and employment uses. Responses acknowledged that the re-use of redundant buildings can provide a blend of sustainable development in rural locations but recognised that this re-use needs to be done in a manner which is sympathetic to the surrounding area. A common theme throughout the responses was that any re-use needs to reflect the original use of the building and recognise the historical merit to preserve the heritage of the District.

Comments from most Town and Parish Councils suggested that the current policies are working well and should be retained and implemented on a case by case basis. In circumstances where a group of buildings can be reused, these should be considered collectively and not in a piecemeal manner to ensure that the most positive outcome is achieved.

Organisations such as the Suffolk Preservation Society and the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB unit have highlighted that the location of the site and the surrounding area needs to be carefully considered to ensure that developments in sensitive locations are not detrimental to the landscape and townscape.

The responses from the development industry highlighted that the current policies are not flexible enough and do not take account of recent changes in the permitted development orders. The Local Plan Review provides the opportunity to align policies with the government guidance on permitted development.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a policy on the conversion and reuse of rural buildings for employment uses (including tourism). The economic and tourism related policies provide guidance on how the Council will consider change of use applications. These policies seek to respect the historic interest of the buildings and setting within the countryside as an important requirement of the policy.

The First Draft Plan takes a positive and proactive approach to the conversion and re-use of redundant buildings in the countryside in accordance with national policy and the Permitted Development Rights. Residential uses are also supported but only in exceptional circumstances and where appropriate to their setting.

Q59 – Should the Council introduce a sequential approach to the re-use of redundant buildings with priority given to, for example employment or tourism use? (32 responses)

A mixed response to this question, but in general there was support for the sequential approach to alternative uses. The majority of responses which supported this approach came from the local community as well as Town/Parish Councils. The responses generally favoured employment uses as

the preference, followed by tourism and then residential use but encouragement for this to be undertaken on a case by case basis which is sensitive to the surrounding landscape.

Alternative comments were received from the development industry who agreed that the current approach is outdated and not appropriate. It should reflect changes to the government's permitted development rights and ensure that residential uses can be brought forward without having to undertake a sequential approach.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan promotes the re-use of redundant buildings primarily for economic, tourism, cultural uses. Policies see to ensure that non residential uses are considered and explored first and brought forward before residential uses are considered. The First Draft Plan includes reference to the Marketing Guidance which the Council commissioned in 2016 to support proposals for re-use of buildings.

The First Draft Plan takes into account the consultation responses and where appropriate includes requirements generated through the consultation. Impact on landscape and local highway networks were common issues raised through the consultation and these have been identified within the emerging policies which provide greater flexibility than the current Local Plan policies.

Business and Industry

Q60 – Should we continue to identify both strategic and general employment areas? (37 responses)

Majority response : Yes.

Sensible in order to recognise the differing nature and scale of employment floorspace. Reflect the distinctive infrastructure and land use context of particular sites. Uncertainty as to the nature, attributes and key considerations that could be involved in making a planning decision for development or change.

A broad diversity of local businesses and employment cited as a reason for and against such a differentiated approach. Polarised responses regarding land allocation provision for growth in the transport sector - eg: *“simply not accessible to a large enough market”* versus *“well placed to benefit from the expansion of the transport and logistics sector, owing to the location close to key ports and the associated trunk road network”*. *“Retail should not displace employment”* versus *“A Local Service Centre with a business centre but no retail facilities, may benefit from allowing a shop on the site which employees and residents can use rather than driving to the nearest shops”*.

Bespoke policies that recognise and support particular main drivers of jobs and economic growth. Make provision including a choice of sites to create the right environment in which the Port of Felixstowe and a locally strong and growing digital technology sector can meet their aspirations. Identify Sizewell 'A' as a General Employment Area to help secure its retention as an employment site in the future.

Provide flexibility and choice for commercial and employment development markets. New sites are needed under both categories. General employment areas which are not suitable for heavy industries should be identified. The east of Ipswich is well placed to support delivery of mixed use urban extensions that build on the existing cluster of employment sites in the area.

General employment areas provide focus points for businesses in dispersed rural areas. General employment areas for Debach and Bentwaters airfields should allow uses beyond B use classes.

Consider alternative employment sites to avoid environmental and social impacts on Kirton and the Trimleys.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses were in favour of retaining the distinction between Strategic and General Employment Areas. Despite this the First Draft Plan seeks to combine these allocations into one policy. In practice the policy in respect of Strategic and General was implemented in the same way and proposals judged on site specific criteria and operations as opposed to whether the operation was strategic or general in nature.

The First Draft Plan proposes a policy which supports employment generating uses over the plan period and details appropriate uses unless neighbouring uses restrict operations.

Having one policy will provide greater flexibility of uses and operations that come forward over the plan period, as opposed to introducing a restriction which relates to Strategic and General areas.

Q61 – Should we continue to stipulate the uses on sites allocated for employment or should policies be more flexible to allow a wider variety of uses? (44 responses)

Some comments in favour of stipulating but more in favour of flexibility. Eg: “Avoid piecemeal development” versus “don’t stifle innovation”. A pilot site might help understanding to develop the working principles of a more flexible approach to use of sites.

Some flexibility of use classes to support the growth of new and existing business and enterprise, especially as the nature of work evolves and new industries emerge. Flexibility to support those sui generis or hybrid uses that may not necessarily fall neatly within a B use class. Reflect economic development as B Use Classes, public and community uses and main town centre uses (but excluding housing development). If employment uses don't emerge other uses should be considered. Focus flexibility on brownfield sites to encourage their reuse.

Stipulate close to housing for community awareness of potential uses. Specify certain types of uses or building heights and massing to incorporate employment development within historic environments. If multiple uses are proposed, these should be considered for their historic environment impacts before they are included within policy. Aldeburgh needs to retain its employment sites as the town has lost sites over recent years.

Mixed use sites - Housing directly associated with business and retail should be considered as was often the tradition with shops and rural services. Should the Sizewell 'A' Site be proposed for

allocation for employment use (and other uses) within the reviewed Local Plan, it would be considered beneficial to acknowledge the sorts of uses that would be supported at the site.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan provides site specific details in respect of employment sites that have been identified. Many of the sites are already existing employment areas and therefore have established uses on them. Policies within the First Draft Plan seek to maintain these existing uses and provide direction as to the type of uses which may be appropriate should the site be subject to redevelopment. As encouraged by consultation responses, the policy for Employment Areas identifies that ancillary uses (including cultural and tourism uses) will be supported on sites bringing forward employment uses.

New employment sites are identified with policy requirements to restrict future uses to those required by various sectors of the economy.

Q62 - Should planning policies take a flexible approach to new employment development where there is an identified need by allowing development outside of allocated sites and physical limits boundaries? (49 responses)

Consider the nature and suitability of existing sites and premises.

Flexible approaches to new employment development outside of allocated sites and physical limits boundaries could lead to undesirable development over and above that supported by the operational requirements of a site.

Policy support for smaller scale employment development outside of allocated sites and physical limits boundaries should be established.

Ensure suitable policy support for local, small scale enterprise and innovation that can provide a valuable source of employment for the local population. It is suggested that a local need rather than size threshold would be an appropriate control mechanism to ensure schemes that come forward warrant additional support and flexibility as to location.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The consultation responses identified a need for a flexible approach to employment uses which need to grow beyond their existing sites. The First Draft Plan includes policies which guide the expansion and intensification of sites which provide economic activity. The First Draft Plan also includes a policy on economic development in rural areas as this will help support small scale enterprises which are a valuable source of local employment.

Q63 – Should the Local Plan allocate more land than is required for employment uses or should we only allocate what is needed? (51 responses)

The Local Planning Authority should make every effort to accurately forecast likely demands and allocate sites accordingly, but where there is any uncertainty suitable additional sites should be proposed for allocation. 'Over provision' for this purpose is a far more sound basis from which to move forward in a Plan than the alternative. The 'science' of calculating need is not 100% precise in any event and there are any number of variables over which planning has no control.

The release of too much land might result in pressure being put on the Council to release it for other purposes but policies that are effectively prepared and justified by appropriate research will prevent that risk.

To allocate more land than is required may create planning blight, amount to land banking and provide an incentive not to progress development on brownfield sites and other sites where planning permission.

This would not be matched by the enthusiasm of investors to supply the capital to deliver these desires. So relate policy for serviced employment sites to investment in the delivery of serviced employment land.

Existing approaches are over providing for B8 uses when considering economic evidence growth forecasts.

Broadband development will create employment opportunities away from Ipswich.

An Ipswich Northern Bypass, with its related improvements to the existing (A12) road infrastructure, will provide considerable opportunity to release an area of land that provides for a quality business and/or non-port related distribution park near the A12/A14 junction east of Ipswich.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The consultation responses highlighted caution in respect of over allocating land for employment uses. The Council acknowledges this caution and therefore only seeks to identify new employment areas which meet the needs of specific sectors in locations where demand is clearly demonstrated through the evidence base.

The First Draft Plan identifies land for Port related uses at Innocence Farm and land for Business and Professional Services Sector at Felixstowe Road. Both of these sites provide over and above the baseline land requirement in the evidence base but are targeted at specific sectors and will only come forward should the demand be maintained and deliverability demonstrated at the time of application

Q64 – What land is required to support main economic sectors across the District? (32 responses)

Allocate land with good infrastructure links for business purposes and to reduce the use of land away from main infrastructure for uses that require inappropriate traffic movements.

Whilst other strategic sites may have clearly defined boundaries this is not necessarily the case with port-related activity. Demand for logistics sector sites and premises is much stronger in Felixstowe and along the A14 corridor in Suffolk Coastal than it is in Stowmarket. This is an important consideration for the development of Local Plans across the relevant areas and an aspect that requires further investigation.

Control Port and ICT industrial clusters spreading to new areas of the countryside.

Port land available at London Gateway could threaten current levels of business as well as future growth potential of Felixstowe Port.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses have highlighted the need to identify land to support the main economic drivers across the District. Supported by evidence undertaken specifically in the Port of Felixstowe Growth and Development Needs Study, the First Draft Plan seeks to allocate land at Innocence Farm for port related, haulage, logistics operations. The evidence base aligns with consultation responses in that demand is strongest in close proximity to the Port of Felixstowe.

Land allocations at Innocence Farm and Felixstowe Road (for Business and Professional Services Sectors) will help to support the main economic drivers across the District.

Q65 – In which locations or specific economic sectors would a co-locating policy be appropriate?
(14 responses)

Suggestions include firm and tourism sectors.

The need for such a policy approach is less that it was since working from home via high speed broadband can fit well with a business model.

Polarised responses on the need for co-location policy for the transport and distribution sector, eg: “any container park should be close to the operations” versus “Inappropriate for warehousing on the basis that it will be largely automated, run by remote working and its siting should avoid environmentally sensitive areas”.

Substantial potential land at Ransomes and Martlesham presents co-location opportunities.

This is already occurring naturally enough so council policy is not needed.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Limited consultation responses to this question highlight that there is a need for such a policy, but also that this is already occurring across the District. The employment policies in the First Draft Plan enable the flexibility to promote the co-location of businesses and sectors should opportunities arise over the plan period. New land allocations will also be positive in enabling sectors to co-locate and support one another.

Q66 – Should the Council continue to identify rural employment sites? (31 responses)

Majority response : Yes.

These are just as important as any other employment site, helping employers to identify and have a clear understanding where the Council will support employment initiatives.

Many redundant agricultural sites should be considered for employment conversion. Promote a planning policy which is sensitively reactive to previously unforeseen windfall situations.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The consultation responses identify the importance of rural employment sites. The First Draft Plan acknowledges the contribution these make to economic development across the District and carries forward sites allocated for employment purposes in the rural areas.

The First Draft Plan also includes a policy to encourage economic development in rural locations and takes into account the permitted development rights associated with buildings and activities in these areas.

Q67 – What criteria should be used to define a rural employment site? (28 responses)

Rural and commercially viable. Access onto a major road network with no pinch points. Rural employment sites tend to add significantly to the traffic and small country roads are unsuitable.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan carries forward sites allocated for employment purposes in the rural areas, as well as providing policies which support and encourage economic development on sites in rural areas.

Town Centres, Retail and Commercial Leisure

Q68 – Are the existing boundaries of town centres, primary shopping areas, primary shopping frontages and secondary shopping frontages still appropriate? (24 responses)

Consultation response feedback generally considered the existing boundaries appropriate. Have measured/modest growth through time to allow town centres to grow unless physical limits prescribe. Town centres and primary shopping areas must have boundaries in order that they don't spread to take up parkland and countryside. The boundaries should remain since they closely map out the existing reality and need not be expanded because of internet shopping. Tight residential areas adjacent to town centre restrict opportunity to alter town centre and shopping area boundaries.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The consultation responses and updated retail and town centre evidence is that the existing boundaries of town centres, primary shopping areas and primary and secondary shopping frontages are generally appropriate subject to minor adjustments. The exception is Woodbridge town centre that inherited older saved Local Plan policies and required the delineation of boundaries for primary shopping areas and frontage policies subsequently introduced prior to this First Draft Local Plan.

Q69 – What areas or locations should be considered for inclusion or exclusion from these boundaries? (13 responses)

Included should be shops, cafes, post offices, libraries, car parks and those facilities which support social interaction and cohesions. Areas that are a long way from the centre like car parks, toilets and

public transport could be excluded. Office accommodation or other facilities which would reduce and deny footfall should be excluded.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes town centre boundaries that support social interaction and cohesions that are contiguous with the uses associated with the policy. Excluded are areas that are predominantly residential or are not characterised by concentrated footfall, main town centre uses or are detached or further away from such concentrations.

Q70 – Should the Council introduce a local impact assessment threshold to help demonstrate no impact on existing town centres in an objective way? (29 responses)

(National policy requires proposals for retail and commercial leisure development of more than 2,500sqm to undertake an impact assessment on town centres.)

Consultation response feedback generally favoured locally set thresholds reflecting distinct town centres. There is a need to set a lower impact threshold across the District. As large supermarkets and retail stores with sizeable market shares are so established it may be unnecessary to set a local impact threshold lower than 2,500sqm, as this may make no difference to local trading patterns. Include the impacts on District centres such as The Square, Martlesham Heath.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The consultation responses highlighted a need to set local thresholds to consider retail impact of proposals that come forward. The First Draft Plan includes a set of thresholds specific to individual town centres and is consistent with up to date retail evidence that has been prepared to support the Local Plan. The lower thresholds reflect the distinct town centres across Suffolk Coastal.

Q71 – Should the Local Plan continue to protect retail provision within District and local centres? (38 responses)

Generally responses considered it appropriate for policy to continue to protect retail provision within District and local centres. This is important to the vibrancy and the social environment of communities. There are components of retail provision like discount food stores that are absent from Woodbridge and some other market towns. Businesses need to innovate in order to keep up with change. Diversification and flexibility to respond to consumer demands will be needed to ensure shops remain occupied. A more balanced mix of housing and retail provision may be more appropriate to help restore the community balance. For example, accommodation over or associated with a retail outlet.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a policy that supports retail including small supermarkets but also commercial leisure and community facilities where they contribute to the retail and service function of the centre in relation to communities they serve.

Q72 – What uses are appropriate within District and local centres? (20 responses)

Direct professional service (A2) uses to local / District centre and edge of centre locations because this diverse service and employment sector is growing whilst traditional banking services provided on the high street are contracting. Provision needs to be made for discount food stores. Towns need to not just provide the daily basics, but encourage visiting, such as having ample parking, and be pleasant to walk around.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan defines District and Local centre boundaries to include shops, local facilities and servicing areas that function together in a complementary and cohesive way. Shops, professional services, cafes, post offices and libraries are included.

Q73 – What areas or locations should be considered for inclusion or exclusion from a District or local centre? (18 responses)

Sufficient facilities should be provided to serve the local community. Included should be shops, cafes, post offices, libraries and car parks to support them. Office accommodation or other facilities which would reduce and deny footfall should be excluded. Rushmere and the area near Tesco at Felixstowe Road, Martlesham, which includes the Community Hall and Parish rooms should be excluded from becoming a District centre.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Servicing areas including car parks, public transport facilities, toilets and public spaces contiguous with the cohesive nature of a District or local centre are included. Where they are detached or more distant they are excluded from boundaries on the Policies maps.

Q74 – Are there particular opportunities in relation to commercial leisure across the District? (21 responses)

Vacant units at retail parks may be unsuitable for change of use to leisure. The choice context for leisure like swimming or a sporting activity may affect people without a car more in locations with a lack of daytime and evening public transport. Planning policy should have a light touch when applied to commercial leisure activities. Town centres should be developed in accordance with their own local character with a strong sense of place and as destinations in their own right. Flexible approaches could help local town centres be opportunistic in responding to meet the demands of the people living in them, to social and economic trends, signals and encouraging evolving interactions between land uses.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Rather than evidence of specific commercial leisure opportunities in the District, the first draft local plan incorporates flexibility reflecting evidence of the small scale, tourism aspect and changing context to retail, cultural and leisure opportunities across the District.

Q75 – Do the existing Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policy boundaries assist opportunities for accessible new leisure provision? (22 responses)

Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policy boundaries assist opportunities for new leisure provision. Thorpeness and other coastal / tourist centres have the potential to support commercial leisure even though they are not town centres. Encourage the visiting of town, District and local centres, such as through ample parking, and environments which are pleasant to walk around.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Feedback and evidence was that the existing Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policy boundaries assist opportunities for accessible new leisure provision. So only minor changes are made to existing policy boundaries to include facilities which support social interaction and cohesion. The exception is Woodbridge town centre that inherited older saved Local Plan policies and required the delineation of boundaries for policies subsequently introduced prior to this First Draft Local Plan.

Q76 – What is a successful mix of retail and commercial leisure uses across the District? (16 responses)

The Local Plan should have flexibility to respond to consumer demands in District and local centres to support sustainable retail as this will support and create stronger communities. Town centres should be the first choice for new shops and leisure uses. A choice of commercial leisure venues is required in order to suit different age ranges and cater for diverse preferences. People should not have to routinely leave town to get their entertainment. More public seating and gathering places for entertainments of various kinds are needed. Town centres in Suffolk Coastal are suited to fashion, beauty, art, boutiques, cookery, independent retailers with specialist expertise and products. Encouraging the retail offer of market towns is important to tourism and sustainability.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Rather than set a categoric framework for a particular perception of a successful mix of retail and leisure across the District, the First Draft Plan incorporates flexibility reflecting evidence of the small scale, tourism aspect and changing context to retail, cultural and leisure opportunities across the District.

Q77 – Where is the best place for new retail development to meet the needs of areas east of Ipswich? (26 responses)

Felixstowe as it has a large population and excellent transport links. Martlesham should not be expanded further, it is at peak capacity for retail and is affecting the retail offer of Woodbridge. Rather than develop east of Ipswich, Ipswich itself should be regenerated as a shopping centre. It may be unrealistic to accommodate bulky goods retail in town centres due to distance between shops and car parking. Separation of retail showroom, storage and collection premises presents opportunity for bulky goods customer collection in accessible community hub locations in town and out of town.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy approaches in the First Draft Plan recognise differences and geographical relationships between Suffolk Coastal Town centres, Martlesham retail park and Town centre and out of centre retail in Ipswich Borough. Differences and shopping relationships include emphasis on different types of retail such as bulky goods or niche shops. No specific allocations are made for new retail development reflecting joint retail evidence for Suffolk Coastal and Ipswich Borough and support for regeneration of the County Town’s centre.

Q78 – Does out of town retail at Martlesham affect your town centre or local area? If so how? (33 responses)

Town centres already have, and will continue to develop a diverse offer which does not directly compete with retail parks such as Martlesham. Out of town shopping can undermine local smaller scale enterprises but there are significant distances between Martlesham and some Suffolk Coastal market towns. Embrace the established function of Martlesham and plan positively in accordance with the NPPF by making site allocations for new retail provision. Differences between out of town retail parks and town centres require policy to be very careful not to be detrimental to either of them. Need policy approaches for distinct established retail destinations, both town centre and out of town.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Retail and town centre policies reflect distinct town centres and include a dedicated policy for Martlesham and Kesgrave that embraces the established out of centre retail function of Martlesham and differences between out of town retail parks and town centres.

Q79 – Are the existing policy approaches and planning policies operating appropriately in relation to retail? (22 responses)

As new developments come along, it may be beneficial to provide new District centres which link well with the new housing provision. Promote small scale provision to meet retail growth close to large housing and employment sites. Continue to protect retail provision within District and local centres. Conversion of retail (or other business use) to residential should be resisted in town centres. It is important that qualitative factors are addressed across Suffolk Coastal in terms of improving choice and accessibility to new forms of retail provision. Smaller market towns and their communities would benefit from qualitative improvements.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policies for strategic housing and employment growth in North Felixstowe and Saxmundham promote small scale provision to meet retail growth close to large housing and employment sites. Policy approaches for town centres have a particular focus on accessibility to, from and around town centres.

Q80 – Is the existing town centre and leisure policy coverage and scope sufficient? Do you have any suggestions for what else might be included in a more comprehensive approach? (18 responses)

Some comments that existing policies are sufficient in spite of and because shopping behaviour has significantly changed. Proactive environmental, traffic flow and accessibility improvements could

help market towns, especially Saxmundham and Leiston. There is a lack of local employment opportunities in market towns, and what there is should be preserved where at all possible. In the north of Suffolk Coastal, local town centres need convenient and cheap / free parking so they can prosper in the context of retail development pressure being sucked south to the 'East of Ipswich' area. Neighbourhood Plans can support individual projects to promote the regeneration of Town Centre and Railway station areas. There is potential for nearby Parishes to work together to reflect clustering opportunities for car parks and park and ride solutions serving multiple centres.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Accessibility and appealing town centre environments are a focus of Draft Local Plan policies. In respect of employment opportunities in market towns, this is recognised as a broader than town centre matter for market towns in the Business and Industry policies and site allocations in Saxmundham. In respect of car parking, transport policies include parking proposals and standards. The coverage and style of the First Draft Local Plan is intended to support Neighbourhood Plans for particular town and Parish communities to address and shape individual projects that promote the regeneration of Town Centre areas.

Tourism

Q81 - What specific types of tourism accommodation are required across the District and in which locations? (37 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

Need to appreciate a move to internet based tourist accommodation sites such as Airbnb.

The types of tourist accommodation suggested can be seen below, there has been a particular focus on camping and caravan sites, and B&Bs. Key tourist locations have been presented as the best locations for further tourist accommodation, popular places being Aldeburgh, Thorpeness, and other coastal locations in general. Overall there has been a clear response for a dynamic policy towards encouraging varied tourist accommodation to appeal to a range of tourists, while also being aware of the impact this has on the existing housing stock, and on the natural environment.

Perhaps tourist accommodation that is differentiated from the housing stock would be a move in the right direction, including for example camping and caravan sites, B&Bs, and pubs. With regard to camping and caravan sites, it is acknowledged that they are not acceptable in FZ3 and must pass the exception test to be acceptable in FZ2, due to their lack of adequate flood mitigation measures.

Types of Tourist accommodation: self catering studio units (4), low cost individual and group accommodation, all types (2), B&B (5), holiday lodges (2), wide ranging and fairly priced tourist accommodation (1), camping and caravan sites (8), pubs (2), guest houses (2), high standard hostels (1), encourage unique and quirky offerings (1), AirBnB (1).

Tourist locations: (Aldeburgh (3), Wickham Market (1), Thorpeness (2), Felixstowe (1), coastal locations (5), near to key tourist locations.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

As detailed through consultation responses the type of tourism accommodation can be varied. The First Draft Plan includes a policy which relates to all tourism accommodation as this will give greater flexibility to the ever changing demands of the market and tourism sector over the plan period. Suffolk Coastal has a distinct and successful tourism sector and the Local Plan has a key role to play in supporting this. The First Draft Plan also includes a tourism policy which places greater requirements on sites within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Q82 – Should tourist accommodation be encouraged across the whole District or just in specific areas? (28 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

Whole District (14) Specific Areas (7) Both (1)

Overall, there is more support for the distribution of tourist accommodation to be District wide, than across specific areas. However, there are also comments suggesting tourist accommodation should be focused on specific tourism hotspots in order to benefit from existing facilities. Also important is the ability to identify the ways specific areas offer different tourist attractions and this should be reflected in the types of tourist accommodation available.

Importantly, it is emphasised that tourist accommodation should be encouraged but not at the expense of residential accommodation (in creating empty settlements in off peak tourist seasons). Creative ways of utilising tourist accommodation should be explored so as to reduce the depletion of the housing stock (in transferring to tourist accommodation). In addition, ‘exceptional circumstances’ should be placed on any types of development taking place within the AONB.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The consultation responses have highlighted that tourism accommodation can take many forms in a variety of locations across the District. The First Draft Plan seeks to encourage tourism accommodation across the District to support the tourism sector.

Policy requirements are introduced to resist the conversion of tourism accommodation to residential uses through limitations on occupancy.

Q83 – Do we need to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses? (24 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

Mixed response on the whole. There is a belief made by some comments that there is too much tourist accommodation in the District, and that it is underutilised. Hence, an increase in tourist accommodation may lead to further under occupation of properties and villages, leading to the unviability of local shops. As well as the impact that under occupation of the housing stock has on affordability.

However, there are other comments that express a need for further tourist accommodation in order to benefit from the attractive Suffolk Coast, in terms of supporting local businesses, and enhance the area as a tourist destination. Comments relate this issue to that of second homes and the negative consequences of under occupation of the housing stock for large times of the year. Where a justification for a sustainable change in use can be made this should not be prevented.

Policy could state that tourist accommodation should be protected in areas that lack available tourist accommodation. However, in areas where tourist occupation is under occupied and there is plentiful tourist accommodation perhaps it should not be protected from redevelopment into other uses.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan promotes tourism accommodation across the District. Where proposals to redevelop or convert this accommodation to alternative use such as permanent residential use the applicant will be required to demonstrate the lack of need and demand for the accommodation. Marketing guidance is included within the policy which seeks to protect existing tourist accommodation.

Consultation responses highlighted that accommodation should be protected to enable the tourism sector to flourish and remain vibrant and the First Draft Plan includes positive policies to ensure this occurs over the plan period, in accordance with landowner aspirations, market demands and the East Suffolk Tourism Strategy.

Q84 – What is the most effective way of ensuring that tourism accommodation is not occupied for full time residential use? (27 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

Comments suggest a zoned policy that prevents change of use in certain areas and that is effectively monitored and enforced by the council would go some way to prevent tourism accommodation being occupied on a full time basis.

Other suggestions include applying conditions to planning permission that prevent occupation over a period of time to be decided upon, 10 months has been suggested.

The policy and conditions that apply to the tourist accommodation should be displayed at the property so as to make it as clear as possible to the occupier.

A further suggestion of ways to prevent full time occupancy of tourist accommodation is to introduce a 'tourist tax' as seen in some European countries.

A couple of comments have questioned the need to stop people occupying properties on a full time basis, with the supporting argument that it aids the vitality and viability of the local economy and community. However, our argument would be that with specific regard to tourist accommodation (for which there is significant demand) there should be adequate supply for the visitors to the District, full time occupancy of these properties prevents this.

In addition, there has been concern that the housing stock in certain areas should be protected from a change of use to tourism accommodation. This is particularly the case in Dunwich, as the permanent community of the village has been dwindling as a result of second home owners.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes policy requirements which restrict the use of tourism accommodation in terms of occupancy. Planning conditions will restrict use and landowners will be required to maintain a register of all lettings to enable planning enforcement to take place successfully.

Q85 – How can planning policy better facilitate the development of tourism attractions to support the resort of Felixstowe? (16 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

Acknowledgement of the varying tourist uses in different areas of Felixstowe is needed in order to plan for the success of the tourist scene in Felixstowe, suggestion has been made that policy should define the different tourist uses in the different areas. Whether this would be too prescriptive for businesses needs to be considered?

By advertising the unique tourist facilities investment opportunities may arise that incentivise prospective business and leisure providers to implement attractions. Comments have also made regard to the beach huts as an important characteristic of the beach front. In supporting the tourist offer in the town more information should be widely spread across the areas that are likely to enjoy the tourism offers in Felixstowe and across the different tourism attractions (bars, hotels, restaurants, shops, libraries), in the form of for example leaflets, posters, pamphlets.

The proposed leisure sites to the North of Felixstowe are supported by Trinity College, as it would provide considerable leisure opportunities for the residents of Felixstowe and the Trimleys.

Support has been given to the provision of adequate car parking, and improvements to the punctuality and reliability of the train line between Felixstowe and Ipswich.

Creating a townscape that includes the natural environment is suggested would add to the appeal of the town in attracting tourists, in the form of planting trees and flowers along the sea front and possibly the creation of a sea front park with children play areas and cafes (possibly linking the seafront to the high street through the use of green pathways).

The pier is a significant attraction to Felixstowe and should be provided for as such. Suggestion has been made to the importance of the pier as a focal point of the whole seafront.

There has been concern raised over the effect that increased port related functions and commercial traffic will have on the tourist industry in Felixstowe. Policy should be aware of this issue.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan maintains the tourism related policies established in the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan. Where appropriate these have been revised to reflect consultation responses and opportunities that have arisen in response to the consultation. Collectively, they encourage a proactive and positive approach to tourism in the resort of Felixstowe and reflect the consultation responses in respect of attractions on the seafront such as the Pier and the Spa Pavilion.

Additional policies relating to tourism across the District and tourism attractions is also included within the First Draft Plan and these will further support the Felixstowe resort.

Q86 – What type of resort activities will help extend the tourism season and increase visitor spend? (24 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

As seen below there is a large and diverse range of activities suggested, which will differ in suitability across the different tourist hotspots. The activities that have been popular amongst the responses are festivals (books, food, music, theatre), walking, and sporting events. More important perhaps, is the decision to promote a diverse array of tourist activities that will be appropriate in different areas of the District. Felixstowe has been suggested should focus more towards the 16-25 age group. Across other parts of the District perhaps a more family focussed approach maybe more suitable.

Particular mention has been made to the potential of the seafront gardens in Felixstowe to become a destination for small festivals, concerts, and exhibitions. Making the most of the seafront gardens is a good way of utilising our existing assets for the benefit of the whole community. Furthermore, different types of events in this location, and other locations like it such as existing town halls and leisure centre halls, will help to extend the tourism season.

There is support for the seafront and in particular the pier as a focal point in attracting tourists from across the many different activities along the seafront.

Tourist provision away from the coast and sensitive AONB may help alleviate pressure on the existing tourist hotspots.

Martlesham and Kesgrave seem to be under way in collaborating to provide, or incentive the provision of, a museum that aims to emulate and promote the areas historic connections to the flying with RAF Martlesham Heath being key in this regard. This idea of promoting historic connections in the form of a museum is an option for other areas of the District also.

There is potential for greater use of the estuaries and rivers throughout the District; fishing and water sports could be further advertised to attract greater interest in the use of the waterways throughout the District.

Fundamental to the improvements in the tourist industry is the advertisement of the different offers across the District. People must know about what's on offer in order to benefit from it. This needs to be both an online and offline resource that is widely accessible.

Activities suggested: commercial leisure, walking (4), cycling (2), wildlife, winter events, skating rink, market stalls, Christmas fare, large and small festivals (5)(books, music, theatre, food), indoor

activities in the winter months (2), more use of the rivers, sporting events (2), outdoor sports, cultural activities (2), animal watching, museum (2) (to promote areas connections with history), science, jazz festivals, poetry, literature, use of existing leisure hall for (exhibitions, lectures, and courses), concerts in seafront gardens, nature/outdoor activities, arts, heritage offer, golf, fishing.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses have highlighted a wide variety of tourism attractions and opportunities across the District. Previous Local Plans included specific policies relating to various locations, but the First Draft Plan proposes an alternative view based on consultation responses. The First Draft Plan includes a policy on tourism attractions which will apply across the District and provide policy direction to all attractions.

Specific policies which carry forward the resort policies from the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan have been included within the First Draft Plan and provide specific area based policies that complement the policy on tourism attractions.

New attractions are also supported in the First Draft Plan as over the plan period they are expected to come forward as opportunities arise and market demand dictates.

Q87 – Do we need a different approach to tourism development in the AONB as opposed to areas outside the AONB? (50 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

There have been no respondents that support the same approach to tourism across the whole District. There is strong support for a different approach in the AONB to the areas outside the AONB. There has also been unanimous support for applying great weight to conserving and enhancing the AONB. However, there have been differing responses as to how to deal specifically with tourism within the AONB. Comments have ranged from complete forbiddance for any development within the AONB, to acknowledgement that sites within the AONB are key tourist areas and so rather than handicap tourism in these locations a more managed and progressive approach that makes reference to the sensitivities of the important natural environment.

In addition, responses suggest a criteria-based approach to sites should be introduced rather than a blanket wide approach across the entire AONB, as within the AONB there are areas that are more or less sensitive to development. The internationally and nationally significant sites within the AONB should be given greater protection than lesser sites.

Furthermore, perhaps there should be a focus on tourist attractions, within the AONB, that have less of a direct impact on the landscape. Walking, cycling, and bird watching for example would act as natural activities on the landscape. Perhaps more adventurous activities should be kept to certain defined locations.

Consideration must be given to the negative aspects that an increase in tourism activity in an area will have on the sensitive AONB.

It has been noted that where tourism development would enhance the long term sustainability of the area, it should be encouraged, subject to careful consideration.

Furthermore, it is suggested that there is capacity for tourism development to be carried out outside the AONB. Whether this is desirable is uncertain. It would certainly reduce the pressure on the AONB. However, some of the key tourist locations in the District are in the AONB. Hence reducing tourism in these locations would be detrimental to local businesses and local people.

The areas adjacent to the AONB should be protected from development to ensure that the context and setting of the AONB is not negatively impacted by tourism and development.

It is suggested that exceptional circumstances should be required to justify major development within the AONB.

Tourism in the AONB should aim to encourage the appreciation of the importance of the AONB and ways to protect it.

While tourism development in the AONB is a major consideration, it has been suggested that where development is considered appropriate the design of the proposed schemes must be considered as of considerable importance.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan reflects the consultation responses in that it details a different approach to tourism development inside and outside of the AONB. These approaches can be seen in Policy SCLP6.3: Tourism in the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coast and Policy SCLP6.4: Tourism outside the AONB.

Vehicle Parking

Q88 – Are the current SCC parking standards appropriate in the context of Suffolk Coastal? If not, what changes would you wish to see and why? (37 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: A lot of respondents appeared to be unaware or uncertain of what the SCC parking standards contained, therefore, they could not specifically address the question.

Notwithstanding this, a number of respondents recommended the imposition of more favourable parking rates to attract tourists and rural residents into the towns. Free car parking was mooted by some as a possible solution. Respondents also emphasised the need to recognise that it is a rural District and the car is the dominant form of transport. Respondents also suggested better provision of off-road parking including undergrounding and parking spaces for electric cars.

Ensuring that car parking is provided in new builds and not lost in conversions of existing properties was also highlighted as an issue. Another problem that was highlighted was the fact that the parking standards are not flexible regarding change of use.

Some respondents agreed that the current SCC parking standards are appropriate in the context of Suffolk Coastal. However, it was highlighted that greater enforcement of the standards is required.

One respondent rejected the need for allocated parking in town centres due to the likelihood of a reduction in car ownership and the development of smart technologies such as ‘ride-hailing’. Another respondent emphasised that the standards are flexible regarding parking provision and are therefore relevant to both rural and urban areas. However, this is re-buffed by a number of other respondents. The promotion of bicycle use as an alternative to car parking was also mentioned by various respondents.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan includes a policy for vehicle parking (Policy SCLP 7.2). This policy details the need for off-street parking, vehicle charging points and ancillary infrastructure for proposals involving vehicle parking. Proposals are also expected to meet the SCC parking standards where they do not relate to design. The supporting text of Policy SCLP 7.2 clearly recognises the car as the dominant form of transport across the District. This is also supported by relevant stats and figures.

Policy SLP 7.2 includes provision for secure storage and parking of bicycles. Cycle links are also included as part of policies for site allocations, where possible.

Car parking prices cannot be addressed by planning policy, but will be included in relevant parking management strategies. Parking enforcement will be addressed through Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE).

Q89 – Is the need for and the importance of, vehicle parking sufficiently reflected in existing planning policies? (40 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: The majority of respondents did not feel that the need and importance of vehicle parking is sufficiently reflected in existing planning policies. Numerous respondents highlighted the fact that current car ownership rates are not accurately reflected in the parking standards or policy. A large amount of respondents indicated a need to consider EV charging infrastructure and visitor parking in planning policies. Park & ride facilities were also highlighted as potential considerations for planning policy. Many respondents also felt that parking allocations need to be flexible in line with new development coming forward which increases parking requirements. One respondent refers to the fact that planning policy fails to address the impact of parking emanating from new housing developments on market towns. Also, some respondents felt that car parking should be considered as part of the infrastructural needs.

On the contrary, one respondent highlighted the fact that technological advancements could lead to less of a need for the car and more of a need for better public transport provision. Therefore, the Council should be focussing on prioritising public transport, cycling and walking as modes of transport. Notwithstanding this, some respondents stated that it would be naïve to think that residents will cycle to and from town/work.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan includes a policy for vehicle parking (Policy SCLP 7.2). The current Local Plan does not include a dedicated policy for vehicle parking. Policy SCLP 7.2 details the need for

vehicle charging points and ancillary infrastructure for proposals involving vehicle parking. The provision of park & ride facilities is also encouraged by this policy. Parking provision relevant to the location, type and use of a proposal is generally encouraged by this policy.

Stats and figures from the latest census demonstrate that the car is the dominant form of transport across the District. This, coupled with the limited public transport network and wide dispersal of settlements across the District does not facilitate the prioritisation of public transport, cycling and walking as modes of transport.

Policy SCLP 10.2 deals specifically with visitor parking at European Sites.

Community Facilities

Q90 – Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities? (45 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- The vast majority of comments agree with the question, all existing community services and facilities should be protected.
- Suggestion has been made that some community facilities that are more popular/ have greater support from local people/ of greater use/ if they weren't protected there would be severe undersupply of the facility/ economically viable should be protected to a greater extent than lesser facilities.
- Others have suggested some facilities should be protected while others shouldn't have any protection.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a policy in respect of community facilities and assets across the District. The policy reflects the consultation responses which identified the importance of these facilities and services. Community services and facilities vary across the District and therefore the emerging policy includes a wide definition of assets to ensure flexibility across the District.

The First Draft Plan also makes reference to the marketing of these facilities should they be subject to change of use applications. This requirement will also ensure that further opportunity to retain the community facility or community asset is taken over the plan period.

Q91 – Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others? (26 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- The majority of comments agree that some types of services and facilities should be given more protection than others. However, there are many differing suggestions of the facilities that deserve greater protection.
- Some of the more popular suggestions include schools, medical/health facilities, local shops, green spaces, historic sites (including churches).
- There have also been a few comments suggesting all facilities should be of equal value.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses highlighted the variety of services and facilities across the District. Some have statutory protection such as schools and playing fields but others do not. The First Draft Plan therefore takes comprehensive approach to community services and facilities to ensure that all are protected.

It is acknowledged that some services and facilities are private enterprises outside of the remit of the local authority or the local community. However, the First Draft Plan removes this differential and provides policy requirement to retain and protect all services and facilities regardless of origin or operation.

In instances where services or facilities are to be replaced, the First Draft Plan includes a policy requirement for these to be of an equivalent or better facility than the existing provision.

Q92 – Where it is not possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment? (37 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

Yes:

- Understanding the value of each community facility/service when deciding what would be an appropriate re-use of an existing facility is very important.
- Suggestions have made it clear that there is strong support for investigating all potential options before redevelopment can occur, and involving the local community when deciding on potential facilities.
- Financial viability should not be the only measure as to whether a facility is successful or not.
- Where community facilities are lacking in rural areas, it should be acknowledged that this puts greater importance on community facilities within the market towns and large villages (gives them a greater catchment area).
- Suggestion has been made that adequate time must be allocated before the site can be redeveloped, in order to allow time for a different community facility to gain funding.

No:

- One comment suggests it should always be possible to retain the existing community facility.
- One comment suggests SCDC should not be required to preserve community facilities if they are not wanted or needed by the community. In which case redevelopment should not be prevented.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Within the policy seeking to retain community facilities and assets, the First Draft Plan includes a policy requirement for alternative uses and extensive marketing to be undertaken before redevelopment comes forward.

Consultation responses which highlighted that it is not always possible are acknowledged. The First Draft Plan recognises that it may not always be possible but in order to promote healthy and vibrant communities the First Draft Plan seeks to retain these in the first instance with an alternative.

Q93 – Which areas lack appropriate provision of community facilities? (33 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- Rural areas lack adequate facilities, emphasises the need for facilities in the market towns and larger villages.
- Comments suggest new housing developments should also provide community facilities.
- Type of facilities recommended (churches, doctor, dentist, schools (2), village hall (3), local shops, leisure facilities, public transport (3), play space, allotments, care homes,
- Areas in need of facilities (Trimley St Martin, Kirton and Falkenham, Wickham Market, Saxmundham,
- Ufford, Chillesford, and Aldringham state they do not warrant the local service centre label applied to them.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan acknowledges the variety of provision across the District, but seeks to take a District wide view to provision. Where of a scale large enough, site allocations identify the need for further provision of services and facilities to be determined through further engagement with service providers and the local community.

Where communities have identified a shortfall, these have been discussed with service providers and where appropriate have been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Framework.

Q94 – Should the council continue to use CIL or Section 106 agreements or a mixture of both? (32 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- A number of comments suggest there will be different scenarios in which to use CIL, section 106 or a combination of both and so they should all be utilised in order to gain the most value from development.
- Suggestion has been made of the importance in making sure the funding that is acquired in a Parish is spent in a Parish.
- Important that where there is significant need for facility there should be strong pressure on the developer to supply the facility rather than funding for the facility.
- There have been a small number of comments that have suggested CIL or Section 106 should be used exclusively.

However, these comments lack a justification for these decisions

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan outlines a variety of policy requirements to ensure the delivery of services and facilities as part of future developments. These requirements will help to influence the further considerations and evidence to be commissioned in respect of a revised CIL Charging Schedule.

The Council will continue with the current CIL charges until further evidence is prepared and examined alongside the emerging Local Plan.

Q95 – Should specific sites be allocated for community facilities? (27 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- The vast majority of comments welcome the prospect of allocated sites for community facilities.
- 2 comments state there is no need for allocated sites for community facilities, and also suggest they should not be used unless there is reasonable prospect of them coming forward for such use.
- Comments suggest community facilities should be utilised on mixed use sites where possible.
- Parish Council agreement should be gained when allocating sites. Further to this Neighbourhood Plans have been suggested as a good way of allocating sites for community facilities. These will hopefully be more specific to local people and local needs.
- Allocation of sites should be conducted only where there is evidenced need for a particular community facility.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes specific site allocations which require the provision of community facilities and services. These are all to be delivered alongside future residential and mixed use developments and contribute to wide variety of existing services and facilities.

Q96 – Should future Local Plan policies provide greater protection for facilities identified as Assets of Community Value? (38 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- This question has received almost unanimous support. Many of the comments suggest where an ACV has been established this designation should be given greater protection than community facilities that are not ACVs, specifically by Local Plan policies.
- Comments have suggested SCDC should provide more advice to local people and Parish Councils regarding how best to deal with ACVs and finance their protection.
- Emphasis has been placed on the protection of ACVs through Neighbourhood Plans.
- Suggestion has been made that a moratorium of 5 years should be added to ACVs, preventing the asset from being sold or disposed of without first being offered to the local Parish Council. Suggesting the current 6 month period is insufficient.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The consultation responses highlight support for those services and facilities identified as Assets of Community Value and the First Draft Plan acknowledges this support as part of the text justifying the policy. The Local Plan is flexible enough to accommodate any further changes and requirements that evolve throughout the plan period.

Healthy Communities

Q97 – How can the Local Plan assist the enhancing and re-development of modern leisure centres and sports hubs facilities across the District? (26 responses)

There is a clear steer from the consultation responses that the local plan needs to assist in enhancing leisure provision across the District. Existing evidence base documents such as the Sports Facilities Strategy and the SCDC Leisure Strategy should be used to identify areas of deficit across the District. Consultation responses highlight that enhancing the provision of facilities at existing locations would be a positive way of ensuring re-development and modernisation of facilities take places.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses outlined that future development can assist in enhancing leisure provision across the District. Areas of deficiency identified in the evidence base have been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Framework and where appropriate in relation to area specific policies and visions in the First Draft Plan.

Q98 – What policies are needed to ensure that appropriate leisure provision is provided across the District? (25 responses)

A limited number of comments on this question, but it is clear that any policy approach needs to be supported by appropriate evidence which can also include Health and Wellbeing strategy for Suffolk. By ensuring that policies are supported by evidence, it ensures that the most appropriate provision is brought forward in suitable locations. Consultation comments highlight a need for a variety of facilities across the District – some indoor facilities such as swimming pools, but supported by other improvements to footpaths, areas of open space and informal recreation as these collectively contribute to good health and wellbeing.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses to this question have informed the vision for the District and the desire to increase leisure provision and promote healthy vibrant communities. The First Draft Plan includes site specific policies which where appropriate detail specific requirements in relation to leisure provision and connections to existing Public Rights of Way Networks, areas of green space and the countryside.

Opportunities for substantial leisure provision will be supported in principal under the spatial strategy and vision for areas which seeks to promote the facilities required to meet the needs of the local community. The provision of a Garden Neighbourhood in North Felixstowe includes specific reference to leisure provision and open space as part of a comprehensive master plan development.

Q99 – Is the provision of a new modern leisure facility for Felixstowe, enabled through the redevelopment of the existing facilities for other uses, better than seeking to refurbish the existing ageing leisure facilities? (22 responses)

In general, the intention to provide a new modern leisure facility for Felixstowe is supported provided any new facility is in an accessible location and is state of the art, thus providing significant improvements on that currently found at existing centres. Consultation responses questioned the need for relocation and highlighted that the existing site(s) should be retained and refurbished in their current location as they currently provide successful facilities.

Concern from members of the public in respect of the costs associated with this type of redevelopment – many respondents considered that they would need further detail before being able to provide appropriate comments on this issue.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes provision for a leisure centre as part of the policy related to the Garden Neighbourhood in North Felixstowe. The provision of the purpose built modern leisure centre is expected to be provided alongside future development in this area. Consultation responses highlighted concerns about the costs associated with a new leisure centre and were concerned about it being delivered without a proactive approach to the existing leisure centres. The First Draft Plan includes policies which ensure that the existing centres are not closed and redeveloped prior to the opening of any new leisure centre.

Q100 – Should we continue with the existing standards, or should the provision of new open space and play space be guided by the deficiencies identified in the Leisure Strategy. (36 responses)

Comments from statutory organisations such as National Trust, Suffolk Wildlife Trust and Sport England highlighted the need for policy standards to be based on robust evidence and guided by any deficiencies identified in evidence base documents. A number of communities considered that the level of open space within their area is adequate at present, but that these areas need to be protected as they support the overall health and wellbeing of the local community.

A number of respondents have highlighted the need for new country parks and areas of open space to be identified in the Local Plan Review. Areas such as these ensure that residents have the opportunity to use wild areas for walking and cycling which is in keeping with the Suffolk landscape, but it is important to appreciate the difference between natural areas of countryside and those areas which are used as playing fields or more formal provision.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a policy on open space which supports the increased provision across the District. The policy is supported by the Suffolk Coastal Leisure Strategy and assessments which underpin this strategy as well. The national standard of 2.4ha per 1,000 people is also included within the supporting text and will be used by the Council over the plan period.

Site specific policies and visions for areas identify opportunities to provide open space and recreational facilities, linkages into the existing Public Rights of Way Networks and opportunities for walking and cycling where appropriate as outlined in the consultation responses.

Q101 – What type of facilities/provision should be considered as Open Space? (37 responses)

Consultation responses outlined a wide variety of facilities which may be included within the definition of open space. The definition should include both formal and informal provision such as sports pitches and woodlands but should also include land which can be viewed but not readily accessible to the local population. It is noticeable that respondents have highlighted the need to be flexible in approach and definition but should include any existing sites and those facilities easily accessible to the local community.

Sites can accommodate the needs of different elements of society but collectively meet the overall needs of the community. However where sites and provision has become redundant these should no longer be considered as useable open space. Caution was raised to indicate that if the definition is too wide then it might give the impression that there is sufficient provision which clearly is not the case.

Organisations such as Sport England identify a variety of facilities which could be classified as open space, with Historic England highlighting the importance of green infrastructure in enhancing and conserving the historic environment.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a policy which supports the provision of open space and recreational facilities. The policy seeks to promote active and healthy lifestyles and encourage participation by all sectors of the community.

The First Draft Plan does not distinguish between formal and informal open spaces but includes a presumption in favour of retaining all varieties of open space.

Q102 – Under what circumstances may it be acceptable to allow the loss of open space to development? (50 responses)

The majority of responses to this question identified that there should be none or very exceptional circumstances where it is acceptable to allow the loss of open space. Comments from members of the public were very clear that there are no circumstances where the loss of open space should be allowed. Many Town/Parish Councils shared this view but some did indicate that it may be acceptable, but only where a new/improved replacement facility can be provided in a suitable location.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a policy which guards against the loss of open space or community sport and recreation facilities. Policy requirements are provided to detail the exceptional circumstances where the loss of open space would be allowed.

In exceptional circumstances where the loss is allowed, the First Draft Plan seeks to ensure that an equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity, quality and location is more accessible to the community is to be brought forward.

Q103 – What type or size of development should provide new on-site Open Space? (34 responses)

It is clear that all respondents to this question consider it necessary to provide open space on-site, however there has been a variety of opinions in respect of the size of development that should provide this. Many respondents were unsure how to answer this question or submitted no comments. However, some indicated that the threshold should be as low as four units, some suggested six. The majority of respondents (both members of the public and Town/Parish Councils) highlighted a number of over 10 units would be appropriate. Some also suggested developments of over 20 units should be required to provide on site open space.

Some respondents have not provided a figure for the size of development, but outlined that developments need to be considered within the context of existing provision in the settlements and any other developments proposed. The size of the open space should be proportional to the size and scale of the development proposed and in accordance with best practice guidance, published by Natural England.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a variety of site allocations and where appropriate requirements for open space have been included guided by the SCDC Leisure Strategy and the assessments which underpin that evidence base.

Consultation responses highlighted the need for developments to provide open space and the First Draft Plan acknowledges these comments on both small and large sites across the District.

Q104 – Which areas of the District experience deficiencies in health facilities? (43 responses)

Many of the respondents provided anecdotal evidence in respect of their local areas. Clear concern from members of the public about access to medical facilities including doctors and dentist as well as the distances and time taken for ambulance services to reach patients.

Respondents noted that communities in the north of the District rely heavily on the medical facilities located in market towns, but many of these are already over stretched due to the level of housing growth that has taken place in recent years.

There is a clear acknowledgement from the majority of respondents that there are not enough doctors and medical professionals to serve the existing facilities which places greater pressure on the services. Many respondents have also acknowledged that when living in rural areas, residents accept that access to medical facilities is limited and more challenging than compared to communities in the rural areas.

It is noted however, that no comments have been received from medical providers. Each of the responses have only been received from members of the public and town/Parish Councils.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes medical provision within the definition of a community facility and seeks to promote appropriate facilities across the District. Policies for Garden Neighbourhoods at Felixstowe and Saxmundham include requirements for provision of medical facilities. This definition is broad and could include services such as doctors, dentists, physiotherapists or other provision to meet the needs of the community and the service providers over the plan period.

Q105 – How can the Local Plan Review further promote the provision of high speed broadband and communication networks across the District? (32 responses)

All respondents acknowledged that good quality broadband (and other communications technologies) are needed across the District. Clear concerns about the poor services currently seen

in the rural parts of the District. Many respondents outline that developers should be challenged/expected to provide fibre broadband connections to all new developments, but there is a clear understanding that the existing network may not allow this – due to the limitations of copper wires.

Respondents noted that the provision of good quality broadband provides many benefits to the communities and can encourage economic activity in the rural areas through increased working at home and business opportunities.

It is noted that many responses have highlighted the poor signal received in respect of mobile phones, radio and tv services in parts of the District. Consultation responses have indicated that the Local Plan Review should take steps to ensure improvements to all communications networks. It is however acknowledged that improvements to communication networks may only be driven by market forces and demand, which may be difficult to achieve in parts of the District.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The consultation responses highlighted a clear need for the Local Plan to take a proactive and positive approach to the provision of digital infrastructure across the District. The First Draft Plan acknowledges the variety of services across the District and includes a policy on Digital Infrastructure which has been informed by service providers. The policy places requirements on new developments to provide appropriate digital infrastructure.

The policy within the First Draft Plan is considered to be flexible to adapt over the plan period to the ever changing requirements of the service providers and demands of customers.

Q106 – How can the Local Plan Review create safe and accessible communities which do not undermine the quality of life across the District? (33 responses)

Respondents to this question have highlighted the importance of ensuring safety for communities. It is suggested that a police presence is a key factor in the creation of safe and accessible communities. Numerous comments highlight the importance of involving the police and other authorities in the design stages of future developments to ensure issues such as access, lighting and parking courts are planned safely from the start.

A number of responses suggested that housing and employment growth should be concentrated in the urban areas and where there is an adequate police presence in the District. Preservation of the existing character and facilities is important as well as ensuring that communities grow slowly and that the Local Plan avoids rapid increases in population as a result of new developments.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses were clear that a fundamental part of the delivery of a successful community is the reduction in crime and the removal of the fear of crime. By creating safe and accessible places, the Local Plan can help maintain the quality of life for residents across the District.

The First Draft Plan includes reference to the creation of safe and accessible communities through ensuring that the design and layout of developments adheres to good planning principles and that

the fear of crime is reduced for all. The Council will continue to work the the Suffolk Constabulary and other service providers to create successful communities across the District.

Climate Change

Q107 – Should we continue with the CCMA existing policy approach? (24 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: The majority of respondents supported sustaining the existing CCMA policy approach. However, it was repeatedly stated that new evidence and information, particularly in relation to flooding and climate change, must also be taken into account as part of an adaptable policy approach. The Shoreline Management Plan was highlighted as an important document in this respect.

One respondent pointed out that the CCMA should not be applied where a hold the line policy is in place which is supported by national planning policy.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan includes a policy for Coastal Change Management Areas (SCLP 9.3). This policy generally sustains the same policy approach implemented in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document . A level of flexibility is included in the policy to allow for consideration of emerging evidence that comes about during the lifespan of the Local Plan.

Q108 – What types of development should be considered appropriate within a CCMA? (24 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: There was a general consistency in the responses to this question, in that, no development or temporary development at the developer’s own risk would be supported. Suggestions included – caravan parks, leisure facilities, agricultural facilities, housing extensions, modular buildings and flood protected development to promote wildlife tourism. Permanent structures were generally not supported unless they were fully defended from erosion at the developer’s risk.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP 9.3 states that only temporary development directly related to the coast will be permitted in the Coastal Change Management Area where there is an identified risk of coastal change occurring within a 20 year time horizon. In parts of the Coastal Change Management Area where there is an identified risk of coastal change occurring beyond a 20 year time horizon, commercial and community uses will be permitted provided they require a coastal location and provide economic and social benefits to the local community. This is consistent with both national policy and the consultation comments.

Q109 – Should the CCMA boundaries also be redrawn to reflect the topography and infrastructure? (19 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: Most respondents, bar two, supported the redrawing of CCMA boundaries to reflect topography and infrastructure. One respondent claimed that the SMP takes into account topography and infrastructure. Another respondent suggested that topography and infrastructure should not take precedence over evidence of anticipated coastal change when drawing the CCMA boundary.

Separately, one respondent identified a particular area in Bawdsey where the CCMA boundary needs to be redrawn.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

There is a commitment in the Coastal Change Management section of the First Draft Local Plan to delineate the Coastal Change Management Areas based on existing infrastructure and topography. This will be undertaken when a review of the Shoreline Management Plan occurs, which will also involve expanding Coastal Change Management Area boundaries to the estuaries.

Q110 – If required, should the Council proactively allocate land for the relocation of property at risk from erosion? (27 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: There was quite a mixed reaction from respondents to this question. Those who did not support proactively allocating land for relocation inferred that if you decide to live on an eroding coast, you should bare the cost. Those who supported this approach were both unanimous and hesitant in their support. For example, it was stated that a condition of this approach should be that the owner of the property was not aware of the coastal erosion risk before they purchased the property. Some respondents suggested that relocation could be addressed on a case-by-case basis or that the local community should be consulted on other options before any allocations are made. Another respondent suggested that there should be agreed parameters before any site is proposed for allocation for relocation. One respondent referred to government climate change and adaptation documents that should be supported by policy.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The National Planning Policy Framework is supportive of proactively facilitating rollback or relocation for development at risk from coastal change. The First Draft Local Plan includes a policy relating to coastal change rollback or relocation (SCLP 9.4). This policy does not allocate land for rollback or relocation but allows for the consideration of such on a case-by-case basis where proposals meet certain criteria. Public consultation would be facilitated through the planning application process, in this instance.

Q111 – Could houseboats, floating homes or caravans be used as an alternative or temporary means of re-housing those affected by coastal erosion? (25 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: This question aroused a diverse response; some respondents felt it was a good idea but mainly on a temporary/short term basis. Other respondents felt that it would not be

suitable for coastal areas and could potentially lead to an unwanted permanent solution. Other respondents expressed uncertainty.

Government agencies did not consider this an appropriate response to coastal erosion due to the inevitable increased risk of flooding. One respondent felt that this is not an appropriate response to coastal erosion based on the level of risk to properties in SCDC. Another respondent felt that there should be a like for like replacement of property at risk from coastal erosion.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan does not allow for houseboats, floating homes or caravans to be used as an alternative or temporary means of re-housing those affected by coastal erosion. Policy SCLP 9.4 only facilitates the replacement of permanent buildings within the Coastal Change Management Area forecasted to be affected by coastal change within 20 years of the date of the proposal.

Policies SCLP 5.15 and SCLP 5.16 address the use of houseboats and residential caravans as permanent dwellings, not permanent buildings.

Q112 – How can the council attract buy-in from coastal business owners to contribute to the costs of coastal protection? (23 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: The majority of respondents to this question were questioning the need for business owners to contribute to the cost of coastal protection. Instead, it was suggested that the focus should be on how the whole community can contribute to the costs of coastal protection. It was also implied that business owners should be incentivised to contribute to the costs by, for example, simplifying the planning regime or reducing contributions. Other respondents suggested that a local levy or voluntary contribution should be introduced.

Some respondents suggested that evidence should be attained and used to demonstrate the cost benefit to businesses. One respondent referred to the concept of enabling development and how this has not been addressed in the document, as it provides a potential avenue for creating coastal protection funding.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan does not include a levy or any financial incentive for business owners to contribute to the costs of coastal protection. This will be addressed outside of the Local Plan.

The Council is aware of the potential for enabling development proposals to contribute to the costs of coastal protection and will consider supporting such proposals where they are justified, transparent and deliverable as a comprehensive package with clear community benefits.

Q113 – Should the CCMA be defined in an area where the SMP policy is to ‘hold the line’, subject to evidence of how coastal protection can be funded in this area? (18 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: The majority of respondents agreed with this approach, one of those respondents agreed subject to the availability of funding. Some respondents disagreed with this approach as they either considered ‘managed retreat’ as a better approach, the necessary funding isn’t available or that it doesn’t relate to the role of the CCMA .

Government agencies expressed scepticism in response to this question as it suggests a review of the SMP, which is outside the remit of the Local Plan, and suggested that if it is to be taken forward it should not encourage further development. One respondent felt the question was unclear.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The existing policy approach in the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan will be carried forward in the First Draft Local Plan. The Coastal Change Management Area will therefore not be defined where there is a ‘hold the line’ approach at Felixstowe. However, there will still be a requirement for a Coastal Erosion Vulnerability Assessment to be completed for proposals 30 metres landward of the ‘hold the line’ line. For the rest of the District a Coastal Change Management Area will be defined.

A level of flexibility has been included in the wording of Policy SCLP 9.3 to allow for consideration of evidence emerging from a review of the Shoreline Management Plan, which is expected to occur within the lifespan of the Local Plan.

Q114 – What wider sustainability benefits to the community could justify development taking place in an area of flood risk? (29 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: The majority of respondents were of the opinion that no wider sustainability benefits could be derived from development within areas at risk from flooding. Notwithstanding this, wind farm developments, open space, tourism, development related to the sea/estuary and/or development designed to withstand flooding were recommended by some of the respondents. Some respondents were also in favour of development in areas at risk from flooding once they are demonstrated to be safe and implement flood resilience measures. One respondent was in favour of development in areas at risk of flooding if there is no other viable option.

A number of respondents recommended the concept of enabling development where development not normally permitted would be allowed in order to help fund flood protection elsewhere. However, one respondent highlighted that they were not in favour of enforcing enabling development in their area.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP 9.5 of the First Draft Local Plan does not permit new development or the intensification of existing development in areas at high risk of flooding unless safety requirements detailed in the Flood Risk National Planning Policy Guidance are satisfied. Namely, the sequential test and, if needed, the exception test. Therefore, any new development permitted in areas at high risk of flooding would need to demonstrate a need to be located in that area and would be required to implement various flood resilience measures.

The Council is aware of the potential for enabling development proposals to contribute to the costs of flood protection and will consider supporting such proposals where they are justified, transparent and deliverable as a comprehensive package with clear community benefits.

Q115 – Are there any particular uses that land at risk of flooding could be used for? (34 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: One respondent raised concerns regarding flood defences on the Blyth Estuary, citing a lack of support from the Local Authority in remedying the situation. Another respondent cited the use of SuDS to mitigate flood risk and that the Local Plan should refer to this. Some respondents also questioned whether any development should be occurring on land at risk of flooding. The rest of the respondents suggested the following potential uses for land at risk of flooding:

- Renewable energy solutions.
- Wildlife sites i.e. wildfowl park, wetland habitat, saltmarshes.
- Recreational areas for water-based activities.
- Agriculture.
- Leisure or car parking under flats.
- Playing fields.
- Allotments.
- Green infrastructure.
- Tourist accommodation.
- Commercial and recreational uses subject to proper flood response plans.
- Residential accommodation in communities protected from flooding.
- Ancillary uses to residences and businesses.
- Seasonal parking.

Studio/workshops at ground floor level, seasonal/limited accommodation above.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan includes a dedicated policy for sustainable drainage systems (Policy SCLP 9.6). This policy details SuDS requirements for developments of 10 dwellings or more, non-residential development upwards of 1,000 sq. m or development that equates to 1 hectare or more. The current Local Plan does not have a dedicated policy for sustainable drainage systems.

Uses proposed on land at risk of flooding will be considered against Policy SCLP 9.5, the latest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the flood risk national planning policy guidance. No particular uses for land at risk of flooding have been identified that will not be evaluated through the implementation of Policy SCLP 9.5.

Q116 – Should the Local Plan Review identify sites for renewable energy development across the District? Which areas across the District would be appropriate and for which types of technology? (37 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: This two-pronged question evoked a generally positive reaction from respondents, although a number of respondents expressed their wishes for wind farms to remain off shore. Reference was made by one respondent to an East of England study that details renewable energy capacity on a regional basis and may be useful in the identification of suitable sites for renewable energy.

A lot of respondents also emphasised the need to locate renewable energy development close to or within existing development and/or to include it within new developments going forward. One respondent highlighted a community friendly renewable energy approach used in Germany which could increase community's receptiveness to renewable energy development in their area. Other respondents also favoured such a community based approach.

Another respondent suggested the inclusion of proximity to power infrastructure and other infrastructure (including existing buildings, hardstandings and roadways) should be considered when identifying sites. Various other respondents, including government agencies, highlighted the need to take note of heritage and environmental constraints during this process. Airfields, car parks and sites not suitable for housing development were suggested by some as potential areas for renewable energy development. However, there was a difference of opinion whether agricultural land should be identified for renewable energy development or not, particularly relating to solar panels/farms.

The screening of solar farms was also a contentious issue with respondents. The majority favoured solar farms, once well screened. Respondents who reacted negatively cited the cost of renewable energy and that there is already sufficient renewable energy development off shore.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan includes a policy relating to low carbon and renewable energy (Policy SCLP 9.1). This policy outlines criteria for proposed low carbon and renewable energy developments. The criterion includes a requirement to provide evidence of a local source of fuel, facilitation of the necessary infrastructure and consideration of a number of constraints relating to the environment.

In general, Policy SCLP 9.1 supports low carbon and renewable energy developments where they provide benefits to the local community and are supported by the local community. This is particularly demonstrated by the fact that the policy allows for Neighbourhood Plans to identify suitable areas for low carbon energy development.

No particular areas were identified as appropriate for low carbon energy development as this will be undertaken where a Neighbourhood Plan is commenced.

Q117 – How can the Local Plan Review encourage new residential developments to reduce carbon emissions? (39 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: Quite a few respondents suggested the imposition of tougher standards and regulations on developers, particularly at the planning permission stage. Others identified a means of incentivising practices that help to reduce carbon emissions by reducing CIL payments, for example. It was also suggested that a meaningful proportion of the energy consumed by new buildings should be provided from an on-site renewable source.

Respondents also suggested placing large scale housing within walking distance of the workplace, transport, retail and leisure facilities. Indeed, a number of respondents referred to the use of sustainable forms of transport such as cycling, walking and public transport as a means of reducing carbon emissions. Provision of on site car charging points, fast broadband, grey water systems and the integration of solar roof panels were also mentioned as possible ways of reducing carbon emissions.

Some respondents felt it should be standard practice for developers to build houses that minimise carbon emissions. One respondent felt that the Council's policy on the design of listed buildings prevented opportunities to reduce carbon emissions; Guidance on this matter is provided by a government agency in their response. Another respondent felt that the Council should mitigate against the Urban Heat Island effect by, for example, preventing infill where compensatory planting cannot be achieved.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP 9.2 of the First Draft Local Plan requires new developments of more than 10 dwellings to achieve higher energy efficiency standards than those set out in the building regulations. The viability of this policy approach will be informed by a Viability Study which will be undertaken in time for the Final Draft Plan consultation. The CIL Charging Schedule will also be reviewed and consulted upon during the Final Draft Plan consultation. It will be clearer at this stage, which policy approach for sustainable construction will be most viable and whether incentives can be provided through the reduction of CIL payments. In the meantime, the Council is taking an environmentally proactive approach to energy efficiency standards in new developments. This approach is being taken in light of consultation responses, the Suffolk Climate Action Plan and the government's recently published 25 year Environment Plan. Notwithstanding this, in exceptional cases where it can be demonstrated that viability will become an issue due to the implementation of Policy SCLP 9.2, reduced energy efficiency standards will be permitted.

Policy SCLP 9.2 also encourages the use of locally sourced, reused and recycled materials and on-site renewable energy generation. This will help to reduce the carbon footprint of new developments.

Policy SCLP 7.1 relates to sustainable transport and supports development where it is designed from the outset to facilitate and encourage travel using non-car modes to access the workplace, schools, services and facilities. This will lead to reduced levels of traffic, increased use of sustainable transport modes and shorter journey times.

Policy SCLP 7.2 requires the provision of vehicle charging points for proposals involving vehicle parking. This will help to encourage greater take up of low-emission vehicles and ultimately reduce carbon emissions in new developments.

Policy SCLP 8.4 supports the improvement of digital infrastructure across the District. This will lead to faster levels of broadband which could increase the ability of people to work from home and subsequently reduce carbon emissions created by travelling to work.

Policy SCLP 9.7 requires developments of 10 dwellings or more or non-residential developments upwards of 1,000sqm or that equates to 1 hectare or more to include grey water recycling systems. This will lead to a greater efficiency of water usage in new developments which will reduce demands on the water supply network and ultimately increase the sustainability of new developments.

In summary, the comments of respondents regarding sustainable construction and carbon emissions have informed a number of policies within the First Draft Local Plan.

Q118 – Should the Local Plan Review require other kinds of development like employment, retail, leisure and tourism to meet higher standards of energy efficiency? (39 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: Respondents overwhelmingly agreed that the Local Plan should require other kinds of development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency. Some respondents suggested that this should be done through the planning permission stage. Other respondents felt that the Local Plan should provide guidance and encouragement instead of mandating higher standards of energy efficiency. One respondent refers to the Suffolk Climate Change Action Plan which it is felt planning policies could contribute to. Guidance and policy suggestions are provided by government agencies in their responses.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP 9.2 of The First Draft Local Plan requires new non-residential developments of equal or greater than 1,000sqm gross floorspace to achieve the BREEAM 'Very Good' standard or equivalent. The BREEAM standards are commonly used by Local Authorities nationwide and are generally accepted by central government as national standards for energy efficiency in non-residential developments.

Design

Q119 – How can we improve the design and quality of estate scale development? (48 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- There has been strong support for the implementation of design guides/codes. It has been suggested that 'Building for Life 12' and 'Garden City Principles' should be adopted, with particular reference to estate scale developments. However, these can also be used for smaller developments.
- Another key talking point throughout the comments has been the approach the council should take to developers. All of these comments suggest a firmer stance is needed when negotiating on design principles, and less weight should be given to the developer's viability claims in comparison to the quality of their design proposals. As part of this it has been suggested to use a number of smaller developers to build out estate scale developments. This would reduce the power individual developers have to negotiate with the council over design standards and provide difference in design across the development.
- There seems to be a general belief that new and exciting designs should be restricted in District, especially in the villages. This is coupled with beliefs that design should not deviate from the existing character.

- There have been comments strongly opposed to the one size fits all approach to housing that some estate scale developments take. Hence, there is a contradiction in comments between restricting new, exciting designs and preventing the same designs popping up across the District.
- Monitoring the track record of developers and architects in delivering on good quality design, and prioritise these developers/architects over others if possible? This can be applied not only to design but to other factors such as affordable housing provision, build out of developments on time etc. Perhaps, developers/architects that have a track record of high quality design should be promoted by the council.
- Another key feature of comments has been an appreciation of good quality green space in estate scale developments. The permeability of large developments can be improved through green corridors. These can also be improved by linking green spaces of adjoining developments through communication and positively promoted throughout development enterprises.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP11.1: Design Quality identifies the consultation feedback referencing the support for 'Building for Life 12' and specifically implements BFL12 within the policy.

The policy also emphasises a strong approach to innovative and outstanding design, which had been highlighted as an important objective throughout consultation responses in increasing the diversity of residential design throughout the District and reducing the prevalence of one-size-fits-all residential development.

In response to comments suggesting the monitoring of good quality design, the Suffolk Coastal Quality of Place awards, reviewed by judges which are comprised of local design experts and chaired by District Councillors, are a celebration of the effort being made by people across Suffolk Coastal to add to the quality of our environment, by creating high quality designs in both the built and natural environment and helping to conserve our historic buildings. The best designed developments across the District are recorded on the Council's website.

Q120 – How can we improve design quality through planning policy? (36 responses)

Summary of key issues:

- The majority of comments reflect a desire for planning policy to implement clear standards/guidelines so as to make sure developments meet adequate standards. However, this may have the unintended consequence of producing similar designs across different developments as there may be certain ways developers can meet the design standards while keeping costs low. This may make deviation from these practices uncommon as profits are key to business success. These business practices may spread to become industry practices and hence lead to similarities in designs across different developments.
- There are comments that emphasise the importance 'locally distinctive' design. However, there seems to be confusion about the term, with many comments having detailed their desire for locally distinctive design and go on to denounce ideas of new, exciting and creative design.

- On the other hand, there are comments that promote locally distinctive design and emphasise an openness to creativity.
- There are other comments that seek more creative design, and emphasise the importance of creating new and exciting contributions to the character of places. Comments mention the use of ecological materials, energy efficient heating systems, reuse of natural resources, and many more techniques.
- I have noted that where respondents comment positively about creativity they are usually talking about innovative ways of being energy efficient in terms of new systems, and less about new and exciting design of buildings.
- Suggestion has been made, as it has been in the previous question, of creating a system whereby the track record of developers is noted for (design standards of) each development and then promoting the developers that have a better track record. This idea can be utilised for more than just design, e.g. affordable housing, build out of site on time, etc.
- Comments also mention the importance of policies being enforceable. Sounds simple but is an important objective in creating adequate policies.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP11.1: Design Quality sets out clear requirements that development must meet in order to gain planning permission and deliver a good design standards.

The policy responds to the support for innovative and outstanding designs by encouraging creative design whilst also emphasising the importance of local character. Hence, good design must balance the requirement to understand and be sympathetic towards local character whilst also adding to local character in exciting and innovative ways.

Q121 – How do we promote locally distinctive design? (26 responses)

Summary of key issues:

- The most prominent suggestion for promoting locally distinctive design has been the provision of up to date design guidelines/codes/standards/policies. Within which the use of high quality materials and diversity of designs has been promoted. Also mentioned has been the ability for the design standards to be enforceable and where developments are deemed inadequate, in terms of design, they should be refused, or collaboration should take place to address the design issues until they are acceptable to the requirements set out in the design guides/policies. Historic England has made reference to the importance of design policies in protecting the historic environment but also state this should not prevent contemporary/creative design so long as the historic environment is appreciated.
- Design competitions have been a popular suggestion. A related suggestion has been made for a design competition but not for individual developments but that would encompass locally distinctive design across Suffolk Coastal and be a focal point for future planning applications. This suggestion may lead to repetitive designs as applications might mirror the exact details of the example design with the knowledge that it would be an acceptable design.

- There have been suggestions emphasising the importance of recognising developers, architects etc. that consistently produce high quality, locally distinctive designs. A developer track record could be set up fairly easily. However, the act of promoting one private developer over another on the council's behalf could be considered as promoting private interests.
- Another suggestion has been to collaborate with different stakeholders throughout the planning system. Working with developers at pre-app stage already takes place to increase the likelihood that an application is acceptable and is approved. This process is important and useful, especially for larger developments that may have more issues to overcome.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP11.1: Design Quality sets out clear requirements that development must meet in order to gain planning permission and deliver a good design standards. If development proposals do not meet all of the criteria they will be refused.

The policy emphasises the importance of the historic environment to local character, while also encouraging creative and contemporary design that appreciates the historic environment.

In response to comments suggesting the monitoring of good quality design, the Suffolk Coastal Quality of Place awards, reviewed by judges which are comprised of local design experts and chaired by District Councillors, are a celebration of the effort being made by people across Suffolk Coastal to add to the quality of our environment, by creating high quality designs in both the built and natural environment and helping to conserve our historic buildings. The best designed developments across the District are recorded on the SCDC website.

In response to encouraging greater collaboration between stakeholders, the policy encourages the use of 'Building for Life 12' for all major residential developments (10 dwellings or more) in order to constructively aid the design of potential developments. This is best utilised in the form of pre-application communication between applicant and planning officer.

Q122 – Is it possible to secure high quality design which is locally distinctive through factory build development? (27 responses)

Summary of key issues:

- The general consensus is that it is possible for factory built houses to be locally distinctive while also being of high quality design. One respondent comments 'As it is possible to specify a car built on a production line many thousands of miles away with a large array of options, it must also be possible to build a modular building to include variety and good design'.
- It has been suggested that factory built housing should be possible in large scale developments in bringing variety throughout the development. However, comments suggest the use of factory built houses should not be utilised or encouraged for small developments (defined as 3-10 units).
- Comments that disagree believe factory built units would not be able to offer interesting designs, and instead would lead to a homogenous and repetitive landscape of row on row of

textbook houses. They also believe factory built units would lack the quality that should be required in Suffolk Coastal.

- In order to ensure factory built units are high quality some comments have suggested the use of design guidelines/codes/policies, which set the overall standards, thereby preventing the low cost low quality case that is feared may arise from factory built units. In addition, the design guides should possibly suggest/require developments of factory built units to have a degree of variety of designs. This could prevent the same designs, which may well meet the design standards, from occurring too often.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The design policies emphasise high quality design throughout and encourage innovation and creativity in design proposals. Policy SCLP11.1: Design Quality states advances in construction technology have enabled the viable delivery of modular and pre-fabricated development options that contribute positively to local character and locally distinctiveness. The Council also seeks to consistently deliver a significant quantum of affordable housing due to the prevalence of high house prices across the District. In this regard, prefabricated and modular built housing has potential to deliver well deigned affordable housing at lower costs than standard residential developments.

Q123 – Should large scale developments be required to follow the "Garden City" principles? (40 responses)

Summary of key issues:

- Overwhelming support for the garden city principles for large scale developments. The majority of comments like the ‘green England’ idea behind the garden city principles. However, contradictorily they also mention their dislike of urban sprawl and a protection of the edges of settlements. Important to note the majority of comments that support the garden city principles do not explain or go into any detail as to why they have made that decision, merely commenting ‘yes’.
- Others have agreed with the ideas of garden city principles to an extent. Some have suggested the principles should be upheld where they restrict innovative and creative designs. Others have suggested garden city principles may not be appropriate across the whole District or for every development and instead each development should be understood on its own merits. Hence, the garden city principles should not be strictly applied to all developments.
- 2 comments disagree with the use of garden city principles. They suggest the high land value before development will result in the low density garden city proposals being extremely unaffordable for local people, even more so than is currently the case. Hence, garden city principles should perhaps not be utilised as they have been historically. They also suggest developments should supply the required services and facilities in an environmentally friendly way with good overall design but that the garden city ideology is not the best mechanism to provide this.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Garden city principles will be utilised throughout our large site allocations, North of Felixstowe and

South of Saxmundham. These sites have potential to deliver significant affordable residential growth alongside infrastructure benefits including education and community facilities amongst others whilst providing significant areas of open space, in line with garden city principles.

Policy SCLP11.1: Design Quality emphasises the importance of identifying landscape and topographical features and retaining and enhancing these where possible, as well as integrating hard and soft landscaping features into developments.

Q124 – Should the principles of "Building for Life 12" be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development? (27 responses)

Summary of key issues:

- The majority of respondents agree with the use of Building for Life 12 (BFL 12) to ensure high quality design standards. One comment has suggested acceptable developments should have to meet at least 9 of the 12 questions of BFL 12.
- Others have suggested BFL 12 is a good programme that should be used but also stress that it should not be the only programme used to assess the design quality of developments. Further research on other ways of assessing design quality should be undertaken.
- Another comment suggests BFL 12 is a good programme but acknowledged that it will only be as good as the implementation of it. It must be enforced where developments do not meet the minimum standard. In addition, exemplary organisations that go beyond the acceptable design quality should be encouraged and held as an example what is possible.
- Another comment states BFL 12 is predominantly designed for urban developments and that we should adjust the programme to suit our more rural setting.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP11.1: Design Quality encourages the use of 'Building for Life 12' for all major residential developments (10 dwellings or more) in order to constructively aid the design of potential developments. This is best utilised in the form of pre-application communication between applicant and planning officer.

In regard to making an example of developments of outstanding design, the Suffolk Coastal Quality of Place Awards, reviewed by judges which are comprised of local design experts and chaired by District Councillors, are a celebration of the effort being made by people across Suffolk Coastal to add to the quality of our environment, by creating high quality designs in both the built and natural environment and helping to conserve our historic buildings. The best designed developments across the District are recorded on the Council's website.

Q125 – Should local housing densities be set for new developments? (54 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- The majority of comments agree with establishing density standards for new developments to help guide developers and provide reassurance to all parties as to what is deemed appropriate. Suggestion has been made for the density standards to be flexible and aware of the many different factors that may effect the sustainability of delivering set densities.

- Comments mention densities should be related to the size of settlements, towns gaining higher density developments than villages.
- The majority of these comments also mention the need for density calculations to reflect the site context.
- The comments that disagree suggest an overarching density standard would be too much of a blunt instrument and instead the density of new developments should be set on a site by site basis. Others suggest there should be lower density housing mixed into areas of higher densities to create a diverse arrangement and type of housing that attracts a wide variety of people. On street car parking and types of dwellings desired must be taken into account along with a host of other considerations. Hence, comments suggest density standards, no matter how wide ranging, do not reflect the subtleties of different sites.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan has not set density standards across the District. Although it is important to encourage the efficient use of land, it is the Council's view that setting density standards would result in a too rigid instrument lacking the subtlety needed to evaluate site specific constraints and opportunities, which is also a common perspective of consultation responses. Site allocations detail appropriate densities which have been evaluated in response to the specific setting of each site in relation to its surroundings and also the opportunities identified on each site.

Q126 – Should different design principles be applied to housing developments at high/low densities? For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings? (30 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- The majority of comments agree with the need for different design approaches for different density developments, and suggest design principles should not only vary as a result of densities but for a number of other reasons. Decreasing the uniformity of new developments in different settlements is a key concern for respondents.
- Comments also suggest design principles and densities should reflect the character and context of the surrounding area. Although it is important that new developments do not undermine existing buildings, it is also important that new developments express unique, interesting and exciting designs, which has been expressed in previous design representations. A contradiction that may arise is that the rural settlements may be seen to have a relatively similar character and context. Therefore, developments that seek to reflect the character of the area may in effect be reflecting the character of the rural part of the District and hence lead to similar designs across the rural areas. Further, this may contradict the desire of respondents for unique and exciting designs.
- Comments that disagree suggest design principles should not be applied based on different densities as each development should be assessed on a case by case basis. The main justification for these responses is to protect the character of the surrounding area.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP11.1: Design Quality strongly encourages local distinctiveness as a key contribution to

local character and high quality design. This will help alleviate concerns of respondents regarding the uniformity of developments across the District. In this regard, development proposals are encouraged to identify site specific and settlement specific character with which to enhance.

Q127 – When would development of residential back gardens be inappropriate? (38 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- The nature of this question and the way it is asked make it difficult to get a sense for the majority view as there are many different opinions. Having said this, there is a general sense that development of gardens should be avoided if possible as they are seen as an important part of family, community, and environmental life. The degree to which respondents feel development of gardens is appropriate is demonstrated in the variety of comments received.
- The most common comment relates to the adverse impacts the development will have on neighbours and the community. Overlooking, intrusion, and space between houses are mentioned a number of times.
- Another common response has been that of the spaces between houses and the size and shape of gardens. Here comments suggest this is part of the character of settlements and hence development of gardens not be in keeping with the character of the area.
- One comment, from Greenways Countryside Project, mentions the importance of gardens as wildlife corridors. Removal or interruption of these natural corridors will negatively impact on the quality of habitats for wildlife.
- Comments have suggested the remaining size of gardens, after development, should be an adequate area (not too small). Gardens are seen as important for quality of life for residents and wildlife as discussed above. These comments also mention the lack of garden size that accompany new housing and state existing gardens should be protected to maintain a balance of properties with different sized gardens.
- Respondents discuss the importance of car parking availability when deciding on the appropriateness of the development of gardens.
- Some comments have made reference to the existing physical limits boundary, and that any development of gardens within the physical limits boundaries is acceptable.
- A number of respondents have also suggested development of gardens is never appropriate, citing gardens are an important part of the character of Suffolk settlements as the main reason for this decision.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP11.2: Residential amenity details the factors which must be considered by developers and planning officers in producing and assessing applications. Hence, concerns raised by respondents regarding the impacts of back garden development on residential amenity will be alleviated by detailed considerations of these impacts both individually and cumulatively, and for existing and future residents.

Regarding concerns that the size and shape of back gardens are a key part of the character of settlements, policy SCLP11.1 Design Quality supports approaches that identify, retain and enhance local character through local distinctiveness.

Q128 – Should the Council adopt additional optional standards in respect of accessibility, internal space and water efficiency? (29 responses)

Summary of Key Issues:

- Majority of comments believe optional standards in water efficiency, accessibility, and internal space would be a good idea.
- Anglian Water has commented with a link to an evidence based document. Here Suffolk Coastal is designated as an ‘Area of serious water stress’. They go on to suggest the additional cost of the standards is likely to be £6-9 per dwellings. They go on to recommend the implementation of additional water efficiency standards (110 litres per occupier per day) for residential developments.
- The aging population of the District has been mentioned as an important consideration in the promotion of accessibility standards.
- Less certain were comments regarding internal space. It has been suggested that internal space standards would lead to the same size plots but increase in dwellings heights, which could negatively affect accessibility.
- Some comments agree with the objective of increasing water efficiency for example. However, they also raise knock on effects that this could create, the most prominent of which has been an increase in house prices. A comment has suggested instead of new housing being fitted with additional extras initially they should be able to be fitted with the optional additions once they have been purchased and the resident can decide whether or not to implement any additional standards. This would give residents greater flexibility. However, may not meet the ideal standards.
- Another comment has suggested if SCDC wants to introduce new requirements on developers then perhaps other requirements should be toned down. The example used was CIL. However, CIL is a requirement whereas the question refers to optional standards, and so should not be considered a like for like comparison.
- Comments that disagree argue the additional standards will result in the extra costs being past onto the residents in terms of increasing house prices.
- Another comment suggests the additional standards should not be implemented and the market should determine these needs.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Regarding water efficiency, Policy SCLP9.2: Sustainable Construction states all new residential developments in the District should achieve higher the water efficiency optional technical standard of 110litres per person per day.

Policy SCLP9.2: Housing Mix has implemented greater accessibility standards in the form of a requirement for 50% of dwellings on developments of 10 units or more meeting the accessibility standards of M4(2) ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’ of the buildings regulations.

Heritage

Q129/130 – What should be included in a positive strategy for the protection of heritage assets across the District? (75 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: Respondents expressly stated that the setting as well as the heritage asset itself should be afforded protection, including the landscape character, underground archaeology and any related monuments. Suitable protection for non-designated heritage assets was also emphasised as an issue. A number of respondents stated that the obligation must be on the owner to protect the heritage asset and if not, there should be a means to force compliance from the owner in that respect. On the contrary, one respondent emphasised the need for flexibility in understanding the cost of maintaining heritage assets. Added to this, one respondent suggested utilising CIL and S106 funding to finance heritage asset maintenance. Some respondents suggested other means of protecting heritage assets, for example, through Neighbourhood Plans, Article 4 directions, EIAs, Site Allocations, Conservation Management Plans, the planning permission stage i.e. planning committee and employing Conservation Officers in the Council.

One respondent suggested incorporating eco-principles into the design and maintenance of heritage assets. Another respondent suggested mapping all of the heritage sites, erecting plaques at each site and providing schools with funding to maintain and promote them. Indeed, raising awareness of heritage assets was a common theme amongst respondents. One respondent recommended the use of a draft policy relating to heritage in the Colchester Local Plan.

One respondent suggested that a clear definition of the heritage asset should be provided before any policies are devised to protect them. Some respondents were in favour of stricter protections for heritage assets. A government agency suggested that a holistic approach should be taken in the protection of heritage assets and that the historic environment should be considered throughout a planning document.

A number of respondents referred to national policy and guidance on the matter of heritage assets. Various respondents stated that the views of the local community should be included when deciding to protect a heritage asset. Recording and mapping heritage assets in consultation with the general public and relevant bodies was a recurring theme throughout the responses. One respondent suggested that a negative approach should be taken in the form of emphasising the potential adverse impact development could have on heritage assets. Some respondents felt that the current policy in this area is suffice.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan includes a number of policies relating to heritage. The thrust of these policies emanates from the National Planning Policy Framework which outlines a clear policy approach for the protection of heritage assets.

There does not exist a means through the planning system by which the Council can force the owner of a heritage asset to protect it. However, the Council can refuse planning permission for development of a heritage asset where it is evident that it has been deliberately or intentionally neglected. This is addressed in the supporting text of the Historic Environment section. The supporting text also provides for a heritage impact assessment and/or archaeological assessment where a proposal impacts on the setting of a heritage asset and/or known or possible archaeological

site. Added to this, Policy SCLP 11.6 specifically requires a full archaeological assessment where a proposal is going to effect an area of known or suspected archaeological importance.

The Regulation 123 list does not currently identify the maintenance of heritage assets as infrastructure that may be funded by CIL. This may be reviewed in the near future outside of the Local Plan process.

Policy SCLP 11.4 allows for Neighbourhood Plans to identify and protect non-designated heritage assets as long as they meet the criteria for identifying non-designated heritage assets developed by the Council. Policy SCLP 11.5 supports the implementation of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans to protect heritage assets. It also provides protection from demolition for non-listed buildings in Conservation Areas under certain criteria.

Reference is made, in the supporting text for Sustainable Construction, to Historic England’s advice regarding the implementation of energy efficiency regulations in historic buildings. This could be used to incorporate eco-principles into the design and maintenance of heritage assets.

The Council does not currently have the resources and funding to map all of the heritage sites and to erect plaques at each site. This could be re-considered if funding and resources improve in the future.

However, Policy SCLP 11.3 provides for the interpretation of the key features of a heritage asset which encourages developers and the local community to raise awareness of heritage assets. This will be undertaken in partnership with developers and local communities on a case-by-case basis.

A definition of a heritage asset is detailed by national planning policy and is included in the supporting text for the Historic Environment. The level of protection afforded to heritage assets in the policies of the First Draft Local Plan are based on the level of protection outlined in the national planning policy framework.

The local community are provided the opportunity to engage with the process of identifying and protecting non-designated heritage assets through the Neighbourhood Plan process. The planning application process provides further opportunity for the local community to express their views about the protection of heritage assets, where a proposal relates to a heritage asset.

Q131 –What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings? (38 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: Many respondents suggested that full protection should be afforded to non-designated heritage assets, similar to that of designated heritage assets. It was suggested by one respondent that a forum could be hosted by the University of Suffolk to decide which non-designated heritage assets should be afforded a higher level of protection. Another respondent suggested that protection should be according to the merits of the asset itself. Including non-designated heritage assets as a material planning consideration was also muted. Indeed, one respondent suggests that inspectors consider it an important material planning consideration based on past planning appeals.

A number of respondents referred to national policy on non-designated heritage assets and how a balanced judgement against other planning considerations is required when judging planning applications that affect them. One respondent suggested that the views of the general public on protecting non-designated heritage assets should be considered through the planning committee process. Another respondent suggested that it should be the responsibility of the SCDC conservation officer to draw up a list of non-designated heritage assets with the community. Some respondents felt that the existing policy approach afforded enough protection for non-designated heritage assets.

One respondent did highlight that non-designated heritage assets should not be allowed to fall into a state of disrepair as a means of gaining planning permission or increasing the likelihood of such.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

National planning policy does not allow for non-designated heritage assets to be given the same level of protection as designated heritage assets.

Policy SCLP 11.4 of the First Draft Local Plan allows for Neighbourhood Plans to identify and protect non-designated heritage assets as long as they meet the criteria for identifying non-designated heritage assets developed by the Council. This is considered an appropriate approach as the Council currently does not possess sufficient resources and funding to identify non-designated heritage assets across the District.

Where a non-designated heritage asset is identified, the level of weight attributed to the conservation of that asset will be relative to the number of criteria met in the Council's criteria for the identification of non-designated heritage assets.

The local community are provided the opportunity to engage with the process of identifying and protecting non-designated heritage assets through the Neighbourhood Plan process. The planning application process provides further opportunity for the local community to express their views about the protection of non-designated heritage assets, where a proposal relates to a non-designated heritage asset.

National planning policy allows the Council to refuse planning permission for development of a heritage asset where it is evident that it has been deliberately or intentionally neglected. This is addressed in the supporting text of the Historic Environment section.

Landscape

Q132 – Is a Landscape Character approach to considering the impact of development on the landscape preferable to retaining Special Landscape Areas for this purpose? (51 responses)

There was a mixed response to this question. There was support for a move to a Landscape Character approach, with respondents highlighting the benefits of having an approach that could be applied across the whole District. However, much of this support was caveated by concerns that any new approach did not result in the 'watering down' of protection for high value landscapes. Similarly, many supporting the retention of SLAs highlighted the need to ensure strong policy protection for sensitive landscapes.

Whichever approach is taken forward, many respondents highlighted the need to ensure that the policy is underpinned by robust and defensible evidence.

Important that any Landscape Character approach includes heritage considerations. Some respondents suggested a combined approach, retaining the SLAs and applying a Landscape Character approach outside these areas. A number of responses raised concerns that they did not sufficiently understand the implications of moving to a Landscape Character approach and therefore did not feel they could fully answer the question.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a policy on Landscape Character which is informed by the Landscape Character Assessment and Settlement Sensitivity Assessment that has been commissioned and published since the Issues and Options consultation. The up to date landscape evidence follows the government guidance and examples of best practice and is in conformity with the NPPF. The evidence provides a robust and credible base from which to evolve from Special Landscape Areas to character areas.

Consultation responses have informed the landscape evidence and fully detail the rationale for the removal of Special Landscape Areas with a more comprehensive approach to landscape character across the District.

Q133 – Other than those protected as part of the AONB and Heritage Coast, which other sensitive landscapes require special protection? (46 responses)

There were a number of specific areas highlighted by respondents (including individual sites), and a number of areas which would already be afforded protection under other designations (SSSIs, conservation areas etc). Of those areas outside existing designations, the majority strongly related to wildlife/ nature sites, including river valleys, woodlands, ancient pasture, heathland, commons etc.

Some respondents also highlighted the need to protect historic elements of the landscape including evidence of historic human change to the landscape, ancient quarries/ sand and gravel pits etc.

In order to protect the setting of important landscapes, a number of responses suggested there is a need to give some level of protection to the areas adjacent to designated landscapes (AONB, Heritage Coast etc). A few respondents suggested all landscapes or at least those out Physical Limits Boundaries should be protected.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes many references and policy requirements in relation to the parts of the District within the designated AONB. The consultation responses have highlighted that locations within the AONB are important and the Council consider it appropriate to include a different policy approach to these areas.

Elsewhere across the District, where important landscapes or designations are identified, site specific allocations outline these as policy requirements. Site allocations (where possible) have been directed away from sensitive areas which acknowledges the consultation responses received.

Q134 – Should areas of tranquillity be identified and protected and if so, which areas should be considered? (50 responses)

There was a positive response to identifying and protecting tranquil areas and a suggestion that we undertake tranquillity mapping in order to support any designations. Work already carried out for the Deben Estuary was cited as a template to follow. A number of respondents highlighted the need to define clear criteria against which tranquillity should be measured and this included taking into account factors such as road noise and lighting. It was also suggested that a sound and sight buffer should be identified around designated tranquil areas.

Some respondents suggested that local communities working with Parish Councils would be well-placed to identify these areas. As for Q133 a number of specific sites and areas were suggested for designation, many of which overlap with existing designations (AONB, local nature reserves, estuaries etc.)

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses to this question have influenced the Landscape Character policy and supporting text in the First Draft Plan. The policy includes reference to areas of tranquillity and dark skies which are identified in documents such as the Deben Estuary Plan and the AONB Management Plan

Areas of tranquillity may be identified through Neighbourhood Plans or other evidence base documents over the plan period.

Q135 – In which areas should development be resisted to avoid settlement coalescence? (61 responses)

A significant number of respondents felt that all areas between settlements should be safeguarded from development, with only a couple of reps suggesting a more relaxed approach to protecting these areas.

A number of specific areas were specifically flagged up for protection, in particular the areas between Ipswich and Felixstowe, Ipswich and Woodbridge, Martlesham and Woodridge, and between Saxmundham the surrounding settlements. Also highlighted (albeit by fewer respondents) were the areas between Aldringham, Thorpeness, Knodishall, Leiston and Aldeburgh and the coastal area more generally, and the areas between Melton, Bredfield and Ufford.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Consultation responses highlighted a variety of locations across the District where settlement coalescence should be avoided. The First Draft Plan has taken the approach to avoid settlement coalescence in all parts of the District through the introduction of a policy on Settlement Coalescence. The policy seeks to restrict development on undeveloped land which maintains the

separation between settlements in all parts of the District.

Q136 – Which areas require special protection from development? (44 responses)

As for previous questions, respondents suggested specific areas, a number of which would already be protected under other policy designations (Conservation areas, SSSIs, the AONB). Outside of these areas a number of respondents reiterated their desire to see all areas outside of existing settlements protected from development.

Again, it was also suggested that areas adjacent to the AONB and the Heritage Coast need to be given some level of protection in order to protect the setting of the designated landscape.

Natural England specifically mentioned to the need to reference maintaining the undeveloped coast. Historic England suggested undertaking some additional work to look at views, vistas and the setting of heritage assets.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan carries forward a policy on areas to be protected from development as well as includes reference to protecting the natural and built environment. Consultation responses highlighted the need to protect certain areas such as Conservation Areas and SSSI's, many of these designations are covered by other legislation and therefore it would be inappropriate to repeat the policy within the Local Plan.

Comments in respect of the undeveloped coast have been included within policies considering Coastal Change Management Areas, Flood Risk and Holistic Water Management.

Q137 – Do breaks and gaps in-between buildings need to be given specific protection against development? (39 responses)

A significant number of respondents simply answered 'Yes' to this question, with others highlighting the value of these gaps in terms of wildlife, views, health and quality of life.

A smaller number of respondents suggested a more flexible approach such as: assessing each case on its merits; only protecting those gaps in designated areas; and, potentially needing to take a different approach in settlements at the top of hierarchy. One respondent also suggested the need to ensure that areas afforded protection were supported by robust evidence and a criteria based policy so that development is not unduly restricted.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan takes these consultation comments into account by providing a variety of policies dealing with residential amenity, character of the built environment and protection of the natural environment. Emerging policies have been informed by the consultation responses and seek to protect appropriate gaps and breaks in the built environment through specific criteria.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Q138 – Should development be promoted in areas which are deficient in Green Infrastructure provision with respect to biodiversity and geodiversity? (37 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: The majority of respondents disagreed with this question. A number of respondents emphasised the importance of ecological corridors and protected habitats, in that they should be promoted and any impact from development on them should be mitigated. One respondent questioned why the Council would look to promote development in areas deficient in green infrastructure, thereby making it worse. Indeed, various respondents favoured a more positive approach in this regard.

Respondents also suggested imposing restrictions on development where green infrastructure exists instead of promoting areas deficient in green infrastructure. It was also suggested by various respondents that green infrastructure should be introduced where it doesn't yet exist; indeed one respondent suggested that all new development should include green infrastructure, thus helping to create a green infrastructure network.

From respondents that agreed with this question, an evidence informed decision that will not result in any ecological impact was supported. Various respondents also expressed support for this question if it leads to development on brownfield sites and is enforced outside the AONB.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP 10.1 of the First Draft Local Plan provides for the protection of existing green infrastructure where a development is proposed that may impact existing green infrastructure. The policy essentially requires mitigation measures in the event that a proposed development is expected to impact existing green infrastructure. This is reflected by the fact that development proposals are required to include various forms of evidence, depending on the area impacted, to demonstrate any potential environmental impact and how it should be mitigated.

The Council has endeavoured to take a positive approach to policy making in this First Draft Local Plan. This is reflected by Policy SCLP 10.1 which allows for development in areas of existing green infrastructure provided satisfactory mitigation measures are considered acceptable and implementable. This policy also facilitates the enhancement of existing green infrastructure through the implementation of mitigation measures.

For existing compensatory habitats and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGS), the First Draft Local Plan affords considerable weight to the conservation of such areas where they are included as part of large scale development proposals.

Brownfield sites registered on the Brownfield Sites Register will be considered favourably for development, in order to lessen the likelihood of environmental effects from development and to increase the likelihood of environmental net gain.

Q139 – Should the Council explore further options to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities and Natural England to determine a consistent policy approach to biodiversity and geodiversity? (39 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: The overwhelming majority of respondents reacted positively to this question, some respondents did highlight that the local distinctiveness should not be compromised as a result of working collaboratively with neighbouring authorities. One respondent rejected this question on the basis that it would compromise the local character. Another respondent suggested that a green infrastructure strategy should be developed. A number of respondents suggested including Parish Councils and other relevant conservation and wildlife groups. One respondent suggested applying this approach to landscape matters as well.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The Council is working in partnership with Waveney District Council, Ipswich Borough Council, Babergh District Council, Suffolk County Council and Natural England to develop a Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS). This is an example of partnership working to achieve a unified approach to mitigate the impact of new development on the protected sites.

Q140a – What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

(43 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: Nearly all respondents stated that high or significant protection should be afforded to locally designated sites of biodiversity value. Some respondents suggested that the same level of protection as nationally designated sites of biodiversity value should be afforded to locally designated sites of biodiversity value. One respondent suggested a level of protection similar to that afforded to listed buildings. Another respondent stated that protection should be given according to the circumstances of each site. Respondents were generally concerned with the impact of development on locally designated sites.

A number of respondents emphasised the importance of biodiversity in general, including the contribution it pays to our way of life through pollination, food etc. One respondent urged the Council to protect County Wildlife Sites and sites with Biodiversity Action Plan habitats and species.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Local Plan applies considerable weight to the protection of locally designated sites of biodiversity value commensurate with the level to which the site is designated. This is consistent with the national policy approach in this area.

Q140b – Should the Council consider a policy which requires the creation of new habitats and enhancement of wildlife corridors on new development sites? (44 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: Almost all respondents agreed, to varying degrees, with this approach. Some respondents suggested that such a policy be implemented at a level as low as 1 or 2 house developments whereas others suggested that the policy could be utilised for developments of 50 or more units. It was also suggested that such an approach should be taken at the planning stage of a development. Various respondents highlighted the need to protect habitats and wildlife corridors

both large and small. One respondent offered a potential policy wording detailing requirements of new development proposals.

One respondent was of the opinion that this should be used as a last resort and that it would be better to retain such sites instead of recreating them after they are destroyed.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Policy SCLP 10.1 of the First Draft Local Plan facilitates the creation of new habitats and enhancement of wildlife corridors on all new development sites.

Q141 – Do you have any suggestions for Local Plan policies to support biodiversity retention and enhancement? (31 responses)

Summary of Key Issues: Respondents inferred the following suggestions for Local Plan policies to support biodiversity retention and enhancement:

- Consult farmers, developers and landowners to negotiate an appropriate policy.
- Refer to SCC's 'Suffolk's Nature Strategy' document or provide clear guidance to applicants at an early stage of development to ensure biodiversity is considered.
- Cease building large scale developments.
- Require a biodiversity enhancement scheme as a condition of planning permission for all new major development.
- Acknowledge and protect areas of high biodiversity value.
- Require new builds to retain the native flora and to keep hard surfaces to a minimum.
- Conserve and enhance habitats next to footpaths in tandem with encouraging the use of footpaths.
- Consideration of the water cycle before the conclusion of the Local Plan.
- Undertake the same approach as IBC for potential development sites and ecological networks on the East Ipswich fringe.
- Do not build on greenfield sites and create more protected areas.
- Carry out a preliminary Biodiversity Assessment before any potential land for development is considered.
- Developments should be designed so that they are complimentary to wildlife and provide connections to surrounding green infrastructure.
- Introduce strategic scale 'mixed use' allocations that follow the principles of garden settlements.
- Include data on stone curlews in the Sustainability Appraisal of a potential site for development.
- Encourage the 'greening' of residential gardens along with the retention of hedges, streams and ponds.
- Recognition of marine designations from the East Marine Plan.
- Recognition of areas whose circumstances have created biodiversity.
- Include landscape requirements in all developments of any size.

- Better provision of trees using planning consent and enforcement measures.
- Provision of stronger enforcement measures to prevent dumping and the misuse of land.
- Include a requirement to avoid damage to biodiversity and aim to achieve no net loss of biodiversity.
- Conduct intensive studies to see how species interact with each other in any one specific area.
- Maintain exclusion zones for the most sensitive biodiversity sites.

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

Farmers, developers and landowners, along with the general public, will be afforded the opportunity to influence policy relating to the retention and enhancement of biodiversity through the Local Plan consultation process.

The Suffolk Nature Strategy has influenced the First Draft Local Plan, in that; it takes account of the ecosystem services in coastal, riverine and estuarine areas.

To cease building large scale developments would contravene the growth strategy of the Local Plan and would significantly reduce the ability of the Council to meet housing targets.

Mitigation measures such as biodiversity enhancement schemes will be implemented where the evidence demonstrates a need for such mitigation measures. Retention of native flora, in this respect, may also be a mitigation measure undertaken as part of new build development.

Policy SCLP 10.1 of the First Draft Local Plan sufficiently acknowledges and protects areas of high biodiversity value. The policy also provides for the enhancement of existing habitats as part of development proposals.

The Council aims to undertake a Water Cycle Study in time for the Final Draft Plan consultation.

Under Policy SCLP 10.1 development proposals are required to include various forms of evidence, depending on the area impacted, to demonstrate any potential environmental impact and how it should be mitigated. However, a preference is expressed in the supporting text of this policy for the development of brownfield sites.

Connections to surrounding green infrastructure and ecological networks as part of new developments are supported by Policy SCLP 10.1.

Both Policy SCLP 12.3 and 12.26 detail garden neighbourhood developments that follow the principles of garden settlements.

The Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken in accordance with legislative requirements.

Marine based designations are appropriately recognised in the supporting text of the Biodiversity & Geodiversity section.

Policy SCLP 10.3 details landscape requirements for development proposals.

Enforcement action will be taken, when possible, against any planning related activities that are not in accordance with Local Plan policies.

Under Policy SCLP 10.1 brownfield sites registered on the Brownfield Sites Register will be considered favourably for development, in order to lessen the likelihood of environmental net loss from development and to increase the likelihood of environmental net gain.

At the planning application stage it is expected that more detailed evidence base assessments will be carried out to inform development proposals.

Other

Q142: Do you have any other comments on how current Local Plan policies are working and whether they need to be amended? (33 responses)

Due to the nature of this question, the responses cover a range of issues but it is clear that any policy creation must have been well thought through with the comments from the public being influential.

There is concern regarding how policies affect new developments. The responses suggest that: policy does not ensure that developments are built in a timely manner after receiving planning permission; Policies and communities were said to not be considered enough during the early stages of planning permission and Local Plan policies need to be in conjunction with Neighbourhood Plans.

There were some mixed opinions on the current Local Plan policies, with some individual Parishes reacting positively and others negatively. Some suggestions for the current policies included: building on brownfield sites to conserve the countryside, adopting policies to prevent out of town shopping developments being located too close to town centres and changing the policies as they appear to form a framework against which to tick boxes of compliance without true in-depth knowledge of the consequences of development.

Another key point that is referenced in multiple responses is the importance of reviewing the plan after its adoption. It is felt that facilities will change in areas and this must be updated in the plan when trying to structure development against facility coverage. The 5 year land supply must also be adhered to on an ongoing basis to prevent the Local Plan from becoming out of date. This is especially important as it was mentioned a government inspector had labelled the current Local Plan to be out of date.

Furthermore, there is considerable concern towards the impacts of poorly planned development and how these developments can affect the surrounding area. Comments regarded the lack of input from the younger generation, lack of time and resources planning officers have to consider applications effectively and local objectors not having enough influence being the main issues. Comments also referred to sites being submitted that didn't reflect the current policies that are successful. In consequence, poorly planned development could have impacts on the surrounding area which will need managing. Examples of these impacts include: dangerous roadside parking which will only increase with the influx of vehicles; settlements being allocated more houses than their fair share and homes being built in the wrong places, creating unbalanced communities in

terms of age demographic. However, there is concern that a lack of development could result in an ageing population, placing different demands on leisure, community and health facilities that need to be catered for.

There are also a number of comments that referred to points relating to wildlife and quality of life and its importance over economic gains. There is a view that increased emphasis on biodiversity would be welcomed in the new Local Plan. It was also recommended that site allocations should be clearer as to the requirement for Habitats Regulations Assessment.

Comments also came forward in response to how we can improve the Local Plan document. Suggestions for the document included providing information in more manageable chunks over a longer period of time, including a glossary at the back and to improve the online consultation system so that it felt less cumbersome. There was also a suggestion to add more details to the maps with AONB, SLA, Greenbelt and other areas indicated on the maps as well as providing an updated performance summary to measure what has been developed against the targets set out in the document. Suggestions also came forward for the rewording of some policies regarding Sizewell A decommissioning, Policies SP18, DM23 and DM24.

Finally, there were some general comments regarding issues that respondents felt needed addressing. These included:

- Direct notification regarding Local Plan to all houses
- The councils approach needs to be more supportive to create more good jobs and houses
- Need to recognise inward migration from London and elsewhere to allow for local needs

How these comments have been taken into account in the First Draft Local Plan:

The First Draft Plan includes a comprehensive set of policies, based on evidence and consultation responses to a variety of issues. Many of the issues raised are outside of the Council's remit (such as government approach to land supply or the delivery rate of developments) but those which have been highlighted for inclusion with in the Local Plan have.

Consultation responses have highlighted the need to create balanced communities, with provision of residential opportunities for local people and to support the ageing population. The First Draft Plan seeks to create healthy, viable and successful communities across the District with appropriate residential provision for all sectors of the population.

The First Draft Plan is based on a robust and credible evidence base which provides guidance in respect of landscape character, employment land and traffic modelling. All policies within the First Draft Plan are informed by public consultation responses where relevant.

The First Draft Plan will include a glossary of key terms and phrases to aid understanding of the document and will be supported by detailed policies maps for settlements. These Policies Maps will provide the geographical representation of the written document and will include a variety of designations which will impact upon land use.

Summaries of comments received in relation to sites (in Parish order)

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
223	Land at Crag Pitt Nurseries, Leiston Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	RSPB	Raise concerns about development on this site and proximity to sites with European designations. Any proposals will require an HRA to demonstrate these sites can be brought forward without adverse effect on designated sites.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as a result of the cumulative impacts of the constraints. These include; the SSSI on the site and bordering the site to the East, within the AONB and Heritage Coast, and subject to Surface Water Flooding and within FZ2.
223	Land at Crag Pitt Nurseries, Leiston Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Further assessment required to determine whether development is likely to have an adverse impact on designated sites.	
223	Land at Crag Pitt Nurseries, Leiston Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	SCC Highways	Improved pedestrian/cycle links into town centre required.	
377	land to the north of Pinehurst, Leiston Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	SCC Highways	Significant length of footway required on Leiston Road.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
378	land west of Marsh House, Saxmundham Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Further assessment required to determine whether development is likely to have an adverse impact on designated sites.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
402	Land to the west of Hall Farm Lane	Housing and Open space	Aldeburgh	RSPB	Raise concerns about development on this site and proximity to sites with European designations. Any proposals will require an HRA to demonstrate these sites can be brought forward without adverse effect on designated sites.	Consistent with the comments made, the site has not been identified as a preferred site due to its proximity to a SSSI to the north west, as well as flooding resulting from the site being situated in FZ3a and FZ2.
414	Former Reades Brickworks, Saxmundham Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site has features of ecological value as identified in a previously submitted planning application	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						Availability Assessment for a number of reasons, the principal of which is due to a SSSI in the Northern corner of the site.
414	Former Reades Brickworks, Saxmundham Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	SCC Highways	Access to Saxmundham Road would require footways.	Comment noted however site has not been identified as suitable for a number of reasons.
414	Former Reades Brickworks, Saxmundham Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	Aldeburgh Town Council	Unsuitable for housing. Should be restored to nature.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment for a number of reasons, the principal of which is due to a SSSI in the Northern corner of the site.
530	The Old Police Station site and land to the East off Leiston Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	Aldeburgh Town Council	Planning application currently being finalised	Site has not been assessed as it has planning permission.
640	Land between Roos and Saxmundham	Housing	Aldeburgh	Aldeburgh Town Council	Conditional support for development of a maximum of 3 houses	Comment noted. Site not proposed for allocation due to various

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road					issues and there is no need to allocate land in Aldeburgh above the existing allocation, to meet the strategy of this Local Plan. Sites may come forward during the plan period within the Settlement Boundary.
641	Land to the rear 70 Saxmundham Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	Aldeburgh Town Council	Conditional support for a maximum of 2 houses	Comments noted however site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
642	Land adjacent to 1 Crescent Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	Aldeburgh Town Council	Conditional support for development in the long term, densities would need to reflect historic environment.	Conditional support for development in the long term, densities would need to reflect historic environment.
904	Land at Aldeburgh Golf Course, off Golf Lane	Housing	Aldeburgh	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Development would result in the loss of a County Wildlife Site.	The site has been identified as not available in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
966	Land at Fenlands,	Housing	Aldeburgh	Aldeburgh Town	Support	Noted, however site is identified as unsuitable

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Leiston Road			Council		in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
997	Land adjacent to 187 Saxmundham Road, Aldeburgh	Housing	Aldeburgh	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Development would result in the loss of a County Wildlife Site.	Consistent with the comments made, the site has not been identified as a preferred site including due to potential impacts on biodiversity.
997	Land adjacent to 187 Saxmundham Road	Housing	Aldeburgh	Aldeburgh Town Council	Conditionally support, for a maximum of 3 houses.	Comments noted however the site is not a preferred site. The site is a small site and there are other opportunities within the settlement boundary for small sites to come forward.
1066	Land adjacent to Leiston Road and The Drift	Housing	Aldeburgh	Aldeburgh Town Council	The site has good access and is well located. Would also be useful for a park and ride location in addition to housing.	Comments noted however site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
855	Land North of	Housing	Alderton	The	Site promoted by	The comments are

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Ramsholt Road, IP12 3AQ			Bawdsey Estate	landowner for residential use.	noted however the strategy for the Local Plan is not reliant upon growth in Alderton, in particular given the access constraints on the site, it is considered that there are more suitable sites elsewhere in the District. The site is therefore not selected as a preferred site for allocation.
855	Land North of Ramsholt Road, IP12 3AQ	Housing	Alderton	Alderton Parish Council	No objection to this site being considered for development.	
412	land south of Aldringham Lane	Housing	Aldringham	Private individual	Particular development is inappropriate and misplaced, village has already done its bit for housing numbers across the District.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
412	land south of Aldringham Lane	Housing	Aldringham	SCC Highways	Footway upgrade required on Aldringham Lane.	Highways comment noted, however site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
412	Land south of Aldringham Lane	Housing	Aldringham	Private Individual	Not appropriate due to lack of community facilities and loss of village identity	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
412	Land south of Aldringham Lane	Housing	Aldringham	Aldringham cum Thorpe Parish Council	Site previously discounted due to being disconnected from village, half a mile from physical limits, intrudes into SLA and impact on Listed Building.	
412	Land south of Aldringham Lane	Housing	Aldringham	Private Individual	The proposal is too many for a small village, there are few employment opportunities locally.	
412	Land south of Aldringham Lane	Housing	Aldringham	Private Individual	Not appropriate due to lack of community facilities	
981	Land off Aldringham Road	Housing	Aldringham	Aldringham cum Thorpe Parish Council	Previously discounted due to being remote from services, intrusion into SSSI and SPA, in AONB, in Heritage Coast, outside physical limits, impacts on Conservation Area and Listed Building.	Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment identifies that western part of site within the SPA is not suitable for development. The Local Plan notes the Neighbourhood Plan as

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						being the mechanism for identifying allocations.
981	Land off Aldringham Road	Housing	Aldringham	Thorpeness and Aldeburgh Hotels Ltd / Private Individual	Land promoted for development.	Part of site potentially suitable, however the Local Plan notes the Neighbourhood Plan as being the mechanism for identifying allocations.
94	Land at The White Horse and Badingham House, Low Road	Not specified	Badingham	Private individual	The area proposed would not be acceptable due to a) the land forms part of the flood plain, b) the area is within a Designated Special Landscape Area, c) there is a need for tree and wildlife preservation, d) road safety issues.	The site has been identified as not available in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
94	Land at The White Horse and Badingham House, Low Road	Not specified	Badingham	Badingham Parish Council	Site is an iconic and beautiful gateway to Badingham with historic woodland that needs to be retained. Development on this site would have a detrimental effect on character of the area.	
94	Land at The White Horse and Badingham House, Low	Not specified	Badingham	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site would need further assessment to consider if development would have a significant adverse impact	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road				on habitats.	
94	Land at The White Horse and Badingham House, Low Road	Not specified	Badingham	Evolution Town Planning	Site is currently woodland and impact on listed buildings is an issue.	
94	Land at The White Horse and Badingham House, Low Road	Not specified	Badingham	Private individual	Must not destroy character of the village but need to provide lower cost housing and shared ownership within the village.	
164	Land to the rear of 1 - 2 Old Rectory Road	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Land is a natural meadow County Wildlife Site and should be treasured and retained in its present form.	The site has been identified as not available in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
164	Land to the rear of 1 - 2 Old Rectory Road	Housing	Badingham	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Development would result in the loss of a County Wildlife Site.	
164	Land to the rear of 1 - 2 Old Rectory Road	Housing	Badingham	Evolution Town Planning	Development would be to the rear of existing properties and access may be difficult.	
164	Land to the rear of 1 - 2 Old Rectory Road	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Development would result in the loss of a County Wildlife Site.	
164	Land to the rear of 1 - 2 Old Rectory Road	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Plot is important for wildlife and the environment and should be retained.	
164	Land to the rear	Housing	Badingham	Private	Development would result	
164	Land to the rear	Housing	Badingham	Private	Development would result	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	of 1 - 2 Old Rectory Road			individual	in the loss of a County Wildlife Site.	
230	Land at and north of New Lea	Housing	Badingham	Evolution Town Planning	Site is a pocket park and would not propose redevelopment of this site.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
230	Land at and north of New Lea	Housing	Badingham	Badingham Parish Council	Site is a pocket park and provides open green space, it should remain as such.	
238	Land south of Lapwing Barn, Low Street	Housing	Badingham	Landowner	Site withdrawn	The site has been identified as not available in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
238	Land south of Lapwing Barn, Low Street	Housing	Badingham	Evolution Town Planning	Future deliverability should be in doubt.	
238	Land south of Lapwing Barn, Low Street	Housing	Badingham	Badingham Parish Council	Site is within flood meadow and flood zone and is unsuitable for development.	
503	Land off Mill Road, Badingham	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Provide valuable wildlife habitats which is part of the Special Landscape Area.	The site has not been identified as a preferred site as the Local Plan strategy is not reliant upon allocating in Badingham and due to potential access issues it
503	Land off Mill Road, Badingham	Housing	Badingham	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	
503	Land off Mill	Housing	Badingham	Badingham	Site is unsuitable as it	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road, Badingham			Parish Council	would create unacceptable density of housing in conjunction with those that already exist.	is considered that there are more suitable sites elsewhere in the District.
503	Land off Mill Road, Badingham	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Must not destroy character of the village but need to provide lower cost housing and shared ownership within the village.	
678	Bowling Green Farmyard, Pound Green Road, Badingham	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Any development of this site to be concentrated only to the unused farm buildings. Important that the countryside remains green and not urbanised otherwise village will lose its individuality, character and beauty.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
678	Bowling Green Farmyard, Pound Green Road, Badingham	Housing	Badingham	Badingham Parish Council	Previously developed land with close proximity to A1120. Suitable for sympathetic low impact business/office units alongside residential use.	
678	Bowling Green Farmyard, Pound Green Road, Badingham	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Must not destroy character of the village but need to provide lower cost housing and shared ownership within the village.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
678	Bowling Green Farmyard, Pound Green Road, Badingham	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Site is well outside physical limits of Badingham and would represent a totally inappropriate development in the countryside.	
872	Land to the rear of 4 Low Street	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Greenfield site not acceptable due to impact on Special Landscape Area, natural environment, drainage in the village and road safety issues.	Comments are noted however the site is identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
872	Land to the rear of 4 Low Street	Housing	Badingham	Badingham Parish Council	Unsuitable site due to poor road access and within setting of the Grade 1 listed church.	
872	Land to the rear of 4 Low Street	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Must not destroy character of the village but need to provide lower cost housing and shared ownership within the village.	
872	Land to the rear of 4 Low Street	Housing	Badingham	Evolution Town Planning	Development on this site would dominate existing dwellings and issues raised in respect of highway safety and access.	
872	Land to the rear of 4 Low Street	Housing	Badingham	Private individual	Inadequate road infrastructure for development on this site.	
1057	Land North of	Housing	Badingham	Private	Provide valuable wildlife	The site has been

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	the Old Rectory, Badingham			indiivual	habitats which is part of the Special Landscape Area	identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
1057	Land North of the Old Rectory, Badingham	Housing	Badingham	Badingham Parish Council	Site unsuitable as no access is available.	
1057	Land North of the Old Rectory, Badingham	Housing	Badingham	Evolution Town Planning	Site rear of the pocket park and not clear how access would be achieved.	
455	Land fronting The Street, Bawdsey	Housing	Bawdsey	Bawdsey Parish Council	May be potential in this site providing development is kept in scale with existing housing stock and layout.	The comments are noted however the site has not been identified as a preferred site as strategy for the Local Plan is for limited growth in the Bawdsey peninsula area and it is considered that there are more suitable sites elsewhere when considering the issues to be addressed including access and landscape impact.
536	Land to East of Holly Lodge	Housing	Bawdsey	Bawdsey Parish Council	A large site not connected in any way to the village community and cannot conceive that development is acceptable on this site.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
1035	Land adj. Saxon Lodge, The Street, Bawdsey	Housing	Bawdsey	Bawdsey Parish Council	Site not suitable for development, its position in relation to other buildings make it totally unsuitable.	The comments are noted. The site has not been identified as a preferred site as strategy for the Local Plan is for limited growth in the Bawdsey peninsula area and it is considered that there are more suitable sites elsewhere when considering the issues to be addressed including access and landscape impact.
1035	Land adj. Saxon Lodge, The Street, Bawdsey	Housing	Bawdsey	Private individual	Site forms part of the garden to 12 East Lane.	
247	Land rear of The Limes, Main Road	Housing	Benhall	Benhall & Sternfield Parish Council	Support is subject to appropriate highway measures on School Lane.	Support for the site noted. However, the site is below 0.2ha and is therefore below the site size threshold for consideration for allocation.
247	Land rear of The Limes, Main	Housing	Benhall	Private Individual	Support	Noted however site is below size threshold for

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road					consideration for allocation.
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Benhall & Sternfield Parish Council	Support in part – development should not extend eastwards past Forge Close. Support is conditional upon remaining part of the plat becoming a protected landscape to minimise impact on existing village.	The comments have been considered in assessing potential site allocations. Benhall is identified as a small village in the settlement hierarchy and has some potential for growth due to proximity to the A12. Part development of the site is proposed. The policy includes criteria related to landscaping and open space. Requirements in relation to provision of additional spaces are included. Issues related to noise and light pollution would be addressed at the planning application stage through policy SCLP11.2 Residential Amenity. The Infrastructure Delivery Framework outlines the
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	Some extension of the development already approved seems inevitable but don't extend too far. Prime farming land and the roads cannot tolerate too much more traffic.	
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	Site would represent very poor or inappropriate future development. The site is challenged and would not deliver a properly sustainable plan and would have a detrimental impact on ecology, wildlife, noise and light pollution in the rural areas.	
493	Land South of	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Petition	Register strongest objection	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden			signed by 32 individuals	because of loss of agricultural land, flooding issues, lack of infrastructure near the school to cope with increase in traffic, school capacity at saturation point, any further development would destroy the identity of Benhall Green.	delivery of necessary infrastructure to support the development. Comments from SCC highways have been addressed through the policy.
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	Strongly oppose such development as it would irredeemably change nature of the village and overstretch existing amenities. Benhall needs a proportion of affordable homes suitable for young couple and older residents which would retain the present character of the village.	
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	Totally disagree with proposed development, would destroy the beautiful village.	
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	Wholeheartedly disagree with proposed development, it would be	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road and Ayden				detrimental to peace and tranquillity of the village.	
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	Site should be discounted as it would spoil the village, impacts on a large number of people and need to retain our lovely village in the present state	
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	Any development outside of the village envelope will be detrimental to the environment.	
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	Opposed to further development as it will have a large impact on residents. Benhall should retain its own identity	
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	Benhall Green does not have the necessary infrastructure to sustain more houses and an increased population.	
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	Site outside of the physical limit. Imposition of houses would totally destroy rural nature of Benhall as there is already a huge problem with infrastructure in the area.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	Private individual	This plot is the only one that would allow natural spread of the village to maintain its identity and not create sprawl.	
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing and Open space	Benhall	SCC Highways	Footway along frontage and crossing point to continuous footway on opposite side required.	
493	Land South of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden	Housing	Benhall	Private Individual	Support provided development does not extend eastwards further than site south of Forge Close.	Comment noted. Part of site identified as preferred for allocation.
494	Land fronting Main Road between Grays Lane and Kiln Lane	Housing	Benhall	Historic England	Development to the south of Saxmundham would alter the character of the town and the distinction between town and countryside, and impact on views out of the Conservation Area.	Comments noted. Site 494 not proposed for allocation.
494	Land fronting Main Road between Grays Lane and Kiln Lane	Housing	Benhall	Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council	OPPOSE. Any development of these sites would intrude into the open country side between Benhall and Saxmundham, and contribute to the loss of village identity.	Comments regarding coalescence between Saxmundham and Benhall have been noted and have been important considerations

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
494	Land fronting Main Road between Grays Lane and Kiln Lane	Housing	Benhall	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	throughout the site selection process and when looking at alternative options for the development of a Garden Neighbourhood. The site is therefore not identified as a preferred site for allocation.
494	Land fronting Main Road between Grays Lane and Kiln Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	We are most concerned that Benhall Green and Sternfield should remain distinct communities and not be swallowed up in a greater Saxmundham. Consider that open farmland must be preserved between Benhall and Saxmundham.	
494	Land fronting Main Road between Grays Lane and Kiln Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	We oppose development which would result in the loss of Benhall' s essential character as a village community, making it effectively a suburb of Saxmundham	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
494	Land fronting Main Road between Grays Lane and Kiln Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Some building here may be inevitable but please leave some countryside between Sax' and Benhall Green	
494	Land fronting Main Road between Grays Lane and Kiln Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	If these were to be developed in total, or even in part, the identity of Benhall as a village would be totally destroyed. It would be completely enveloped in a sprawling, unsustainable housing estate that would stretch from Saxmundham out to the A12	
494	Land fronting Main Road between Grays Lane and Kiln Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Site 494 is within the boundary of Benhall, has excellent road access and does not impact many people directly and should therefore be considered for small scale expansion.	
494	Land fronting Main Road between Grays Lane and Kiln Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Development on this site would mean ribbon development out of the town to swallow up Benhall Green and Sternfield too. This would be at the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					expense of the landscape and the villages identity	
494	Land fronting Main Road between Grays Lane and Kiln Lane	Housing	Benhall	SCC Highways	Potential impact upon Church Street signalised junction. Detailed analysis and potential mitigation required. Footway widening required on Main Rd. Assess in conjunction with adjacent sites.	
507	Land opposite Sunnyside, School Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private Individual	Support	Noted however site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
507	Land opposite Sunnyside, School Lane, IP17 1HE	Housing	Benhall	Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council	Support is subject to appropriate highway measures along School Lane.	The site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
507	Land opposite Sunnyside, School Lane, IP17 1HE	Housing	Benhall	SCC Highways	School Lane is totally unsuitable for access to any new housing. Site is outside of the physical limits boundary and does not conform with any Local Plan requirements.	
687	Land at Friday Street Farm, Adjoining the	Housing	Benhall	Benhall and Sternfield Parish	These sites are remote from the village, and would constitute intrusion into	The site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	A12. IP17 1JU			Council	open countryside.	related to the form of the settlement.
687	Land at Friday Street Farm, Adjoining the A12. IP17 1JU	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	We are most concerned that Benhall Green and Sternfield should remain distinct communities and not be swallowed up in a greater Saxmundham. Consider that open farmland must be preserved between Benhall and Saxmundham.	
687	Land at Friday Street Farm, Adjoining the A12. IP17 1JU	Housing	Benhall	SCC Highways	Remote from local amenities. Adjacent to junction with history of injury accidents.	The site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
688	Land at Friday Street Farm, Rose Hill, Friday Street, IP17 1JU	Housing	Benhall	Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council	These sites are remote from the village, and would constitute intrusion into open countryside.	
688	Land at Friday Street Farm, Rose Hill, Friday Street, IP17 1JU	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	We are most concerned that Benhall Green and Sternfield should remain distinct communities and not be swallowed up in a greater Saxmundham. Consider that open farmland must be preserved between Benhall and Saxmundham.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Benhall	Historic England	Development to the south of Saxmundham would alter the character of the town and the distinction between town and countryside, and impact on views out of the Conservation Area.	Comments noted. Site 715 not proposed for allocation.
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council	OPPOSE. Any development of these sites would intrude into the open country side between Benhall and Saxmundham, and contribute to the loss of village identity.	Comments regarding coalescence between Saxmundham and Benhall have been noted and have been important considerations throughout the site selection process and when looking at alternative options for the development of a Garden Neighbourhood. The site is therefore not identified as a preferred site for allocation.
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Private individual	We are most concerned that Benhall Green and Sternfield should remain distinct communities and not be swallowed up in a greater Saxmundham. Consider that open farmland must be preserved between Benhall and Saxmundham.	
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Private individual	I believe parts of plots 715 and 494 might be a better alternative and affect fewer residents	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Pigeon Investment Management Ltd	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Private individual	We oppose development which would result in the loss of Benhall's essential character as a village community, making it effectively a suburb of Saxmundham.	
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Private individual	Some building here may be inevitable but please leave some countryside between Sax' and Benhall Green	
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Private individual	Inappropriate as unsuitable ribbon developments and	
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Private individual		

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					link up Saxmundham with existing settlement of Benhall.	
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Private individual	If these were to be developed in total, or even in part, the identity of Benhall as a village would be totally destroyed. It would be completely enveloped in a sprawling, unsustainable housing estate that would stretch from Saxmundham out to the A12	
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Private individual	Suggested plots would mean ribbon development out of the town to swallow up Benhall Green and Sternfield too.	
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	Private individual	We believe the potential for development of these areas to be ill considered and represent very poor or in appropriate future development for the reasons given above.	
715	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing, open space	Benhall	SCC Highways	Links to east and north of site required - with adjacent site 714. Potential	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					impact upon Church Street signalised junction. Detailed analysis and potential mitigation required. Assess in conjunction with adjacent sites	
716	Land South of Saxmundham	Employment, open space	Benhall	Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council	OPPOSE. Any development west of the A12 is opposed as being remote from existing development, and sets an undesirable precedence.	The site has not been identified as a preferred sites for employment as incorporating employment land within the South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood is considered to provide more benefits in terms of linking with new housing and the town centre.
716	Land South of Saxmundham	Employment, open space	Benhall	Private individual	We are most concerned that Benhall Green and Sternfield should remain distinct communities and not be swallowed up in a greater Saxmundham. Consider that open farmland must be preserved between Benhall and Saxmundham.	
716	Land South of Saxmundham	Employment, open space	Benhall	Pigeon Investment Management Ltd	Site promoted by landowner for a master plan development.	
716	Land South of Saxmundham	Employment, open space	Benhall	Suffolk Wildlife	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
				Trust	contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
716	Land South of Saxmundham	Employment, open space	Benhall	Saxmundham Town Council	Strong concerns about accepting development to the west of the A12.	
716	Land South of Saxmundham	Employment, open space	Benhall	Private individual	We believe the potential for development of these areas to be ill considered and represent very poor or in appropriate future development for the reasons given above	
716	Land South of Saxmundham	Employment, open space	Benhall	Private individual	716 inappropriate as unconnected to existing development and will require new access road to major highway.	
716	Land South of Saxmundham	Employment, open space	Benhall	SCC Highways	Access via A12. Potentially significant investment to provide suitable junction layout. Assess in	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					conjunction with adjacent sites.	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private Individual	Support provided development does not extend eastwards further than site south of Forge Close.	Considering the allocation of site 493 and the scale of development South of Saxmundham, the site has been discounted as it would be inappropriate to allocate further development in the settlement within this Local Plan.
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council	OPPOSE. Development of this plot would be 'out of scale' and inconsistent with preserving the character of the village.	Considering the allocation of site 493 and the scale of development South of Saxmundham, the site has been discounted as it would be inappropriate to allocate further development in the settlement within this Local Plan.
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Some extension of the small development already approved seems inevitable, but please don't extend too far.	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private individual and petition signed by 32 individuals	Register strongest possible objection because site is earmarked as greenfield and essential for agriculture. Risk of flooding, traffic and	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					highway safety, school capacity and destroying the identity of Benhall	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	We would oppose such intense development on these two sites as being well beyond the needs of the existing population in the foreseeable future and therefore likely to attract a considerable proportion of second-home owners and holiday lets. This would irredeemably change the nature of the village and would overstretch existing amenities	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	I totally disagree with this planning not only will it destroy a beautiful village and my house backs into site 751 and this would make live unbearable we have view of fields and enjoy the wildlife and quiet and this would be affected if buildings were built at the back not only this it would affect my quality of life as	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					well as affect the wild life.	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Site is behind my house and have enjoyed peace and tranquillity for a long period with lovely views across the fields. I sincerely hope this does not go ahead.	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Should be discounted because it is a small piece of land that has already been overturned for development, impacts a large number of people	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Site is outside the village envelope. In preparation of a new Local Plan I would hope the District council remembers that Benhall is classified as a village and the overall additional housing requirements under the current Local Plan were deemed to be "minimal".	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Opposed to further development as this will have a large impact on a great number of residents.	
751	Land behind	Housing	Benhall	Private	Development would	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close			individual	adversely affect the aesthetics and character of the village.	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	These sites are both outside the physical limit and therefore in countryside. In addition to conflicting with many of the criteria for development in the Local Plan, the principal concern, if both these plots were to be built on, would be one of scale. The imposition of hundreds of houses here would totally destroy the rural nature of Benhall and its status as a village.	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Development on this site would have the biggest impact on the largest number of people of all of the development sites proposed in Benhall. Consideration should be given to other sites that do not cause such an impact on peoples lives. People choose to live in Benhall due to it's rural nature and	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					'village appeal' - building to any extent will change that forever	
751	Land behind Herons Way and Meadow Walk, Festival Close	Housing	Benhall	SCC Highways	Connection to B1121 via site 493 required.	
817	Land adj to Alder Close, Aldecar lane	Housing	Benhall	Private Individual	Support	Noted however site is below size threshold for consideration for allocation
817	Land adj to Alder Close, Aldecar lane	Housing	Benhall	Benhall & Sternfield Parish Council	SUPPORT. 818 is within the current village envelope, and 817 is well related to it.	The site is below 0.2ha and is therefore below the site size threshold for consideration for allocation.
817	Land adj to Alder Close, Aldecar lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	As the landowners, would like to propose the site for self build units and offered to local people on the self build register in the first instance.	
817	Land adj to Alder Close, Aldecar lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Site is an established house and I do not understand why it is listed as land proposed for development.	
818	Land at Lime Barn, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private Individual	Support	Noted however site is below size threshold for consideration for allocation.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
818	Land at Lime Barn, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Benhall & Sternfield Parish Council	SUPPORT. 818 is within the current village envelope, and 817 is well related to it.	The site is below 0.2ha and is therefore below the site size threshold for consideration for allocation.
818	Land at Lime Barn, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	As the owners of the land we wish to remove this site from the Local Plan process.	
818	Land at Lime Barn, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Site is outside of the physical limit and therefore countryside. Development on this site would further contribute to the urbanisation of this part of the village.	
819	Land adj to Ella House, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Benhall & Sternfield Parish Council	OPPOSE. Development of these sites would constitute unacceptable intrusion into Special Landscape Areas.	The site has been discounted, the primary issue being impact on the sensitive landscape.
819	Land adj to Ella House, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	As the landowners, would like to propose the site for self build units and offered to local people on the self build register in the first instance.	
819	Land adj to Ella House, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Permission for housing development has been denied multiple times for this site in the last few years and none of the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					criteria that led to these decisions has changed.	
819	Land adj to Ella House, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	This plot has had applications to develop submitted five times in as many years. All have been refused, including by the Secretary of State	
820	Land at Woodlands, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Benhall & Sternfield Parish Council	OPPOSE. Development of these sites would constitute unacceptable intrusion into Special Landscape Areas.	The site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to a settlement.
820	Land at Woodlands, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	As the landowners, would like to propose the site for self build units and offered to local people on the self build register in the first instance.	
820	Land at Woodlands, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Virtually all the concerns that lead to the refusal of Planning Permission on 819 would also apply to this plot and on this basis; it too should be removed from the list of proposed sites.	
820	Land at Woodlands, Aldecar Lane	Housing	Benhall	Private individual	Narrow single track dead-end road access. Unsuitable for development and lies outside of the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					village boundary. Expect significant objections and a real fight should a proposal to develop be entertained on these plots.	
137	Land surrounding area of the Old Post Office, Old Post Office Lane	physical limits retention (area to be protected from development)	Blaxhall	Evolution Town Planning	Site should remain undeveloped small holdings.	Blaxhall has been identified as a settlement in the countryside in the updated settlement hierarchy, and therefore, the Council has looked elsewhere to allocate sites. The site has been submitted as an area to be protected from development and therefore, has not been considered as a potential site allocation.
163	Land north of Ship Corner, opposite Rose Cottage	Not specified	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Parish Council	Parish Council in favour of development on this site, after 650 and 729.	Comments noted. Blaxhall is identified as being in the countryside in the settlement hierarchy and therefore no sites are proposed for allocation.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
163	Land north of Ship Corner, opposite Rose Cottage	Not specified	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Parish Council	Parish Council cautiously in favour of 1-2 properties being developed on this site but need to ensure style is in keeping with neighbouring properties.	Blaxhall has been identified as a settlement in the countryside in the updated settlement hierarchy, and therefore, the Council has looked elsewhere to allocate sites. The site is below 0.2ha and is therefore below the site size threshold for consideration for allocation.
163	Land north of Ship Corner, opposite Rose Cottage	Not specified	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Commons and Open Spaces Charitable Trust	Site is currently used as a paddock and access would require approval of Secretary of State and would be opposed by Trust as encroachment of common land. Site is also subject to localised flash flooding.	
163	Land north of Ship Corner, opposite Rose Cottage	Not specified	Blaxhall	Private individual	Access to the site is across common land which is not possible to overcome. Most of the common in Blaxhall has been registered as an Asset of Community Value, has poor road access and is subject to localised flooding.	
163	Land north of Ship Corner, opposite Rose Cottage	Not specified	Blaxhall	Private individual	Opposed development on this site, land can only be reached by crossing common land and access would in my view	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					bedangerous.	
427	Land south of Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Most appropriate land for development – it is in the heart of the village and surrounded by other houses.	Blaxhall has been identified as a settlement in the countryside in the updated settlement hierarchy, and therefore, the Council has looked elsewhere to allocate sites.
427	land south of Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Parish Council	Parish Council strongly opposed to any development on the existing allotment sites.	Comments related to the allotments are noted and the site is identified as potentially suitable following the SHELAA methodology only if alternative allotment space was available. Blaxhall has been identified as a settlement in the countryside in the updated settlement hierarchy, and therefore, the Council has looked elsewhere to allocate sites.
427	land south of Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Commons and Open Spaces Charitable Trust	The Trust is strongly opposed to any development on the existing allotment sites. Development here would cause substantial harm to local distinctiveness.	
427	land south of Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Removal of the allotments would be a great loss to the village. Allotments represent a green space at the heart of the village and they should be retained.	
427	land south of Old Post Office	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	If site is developed where would the replacement	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Lane				allotments be?	
427	land south of Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Opposed to building on this site, would irrevocably change the nature of village.	
427	land south of Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Blaxhall	Evolution Town Planning	Site is an area to be protected from development and therefore not available.	
427	land south of Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Crossroads prone to flooding, little infrastructure in the village. Number of second homes in the village is detrimental and this should be tackled before more development takes place.	
427	land south of Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Occupants of any new houses would have no employment opportunities in the village, no bus services, no shops, heavily dependent on motor car.	
427	land south of Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Proposal would greatly harm the character and setting of the village.	
649	Station Road Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Parish Council	Strongly opposed to any development on this site.	The comments are noted and the site identified as unsuitable

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
649	Station Road Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Commons and Open Spaces Charitable Trust	The Trust is strongly opposed to any development on the existing allotment sites. Development here would cause substantial harm to local distinctiveness	in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement
649	Station Road Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Open farmland which causes flooding on the roads due to elevation	
649	Station Road Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Building on this site would devastate the views of Mill Common and exacerbate the risk of flooding.	
649	Station Road Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	
649	Station Road Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Greenfield site outside of development boundary. Any development in this location would result in substantial harm to local character and distinctiveness.	
649	Station Road Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Any development along this road would be extremely intrusive.	
649	Station Road Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Crossroads prone to flooding, little	
649	Station Road Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Crossroads prone to flooding, little	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					infrastructure in the village. Number of second homes in the village is detrimental and this should be tackled before more development takes place.	
649	Station Road Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Development here would conflict with existing character of the village and landscape.	
650	Mill Common Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Parish Council	Parish Council in favour of development on this site.	Blaxhall has been identified as a settlement in the countryside in the updated settlement hierarchy, and therefore, the Council has looked elsewhere to allocate sites.
650	Mill Common Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Parish Council	In favour of the site providing the number of homes is scaled back to 2-3 properties.	Blaxhall has been identified as a settlement in the countryside in the updated settlement hierarchy, and therefore, the Council has looked elsewhere to allocate sites.
650	Mill Common Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Commons and Open Spaces Charitable Trust	Concern that development would set a precedent for ribbon development, with poor access and detrimental impact on setting of Mill Common.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Site assessments fail to recognise proximity of the site to the SPA and other environmental designations.	
650	Mill Common Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Roads are inadequate and would become dangerous for increased traffic that would result from extra housing.	
650	Mill Common Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Support very limited development on the Snape Road	
650	Mill Common Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	
650	Mill Common Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Least destructive of proposed sites is this one. Careful thought would need to be given to how and where vehicles would access the site.	
650	Mill Common Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Prominent site which would take housing closer to Blaxhall Common. Any future incremental development would have a greater detrimental impact on the setting of the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Common.	
729	Blaxhall Hall, Little Glenham	Housing	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Parish Council	Parish Council in favour of development on this site.	Comments noted however Blaxhall is identified as being in the countryside in the settlement hierarchy and therefore no sites are proposed for allocation.
1090	Longfield Nursery, Rectory Road, Stone Common, Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Parish Council	Parish Council strongly opposes any development on this site.	Blaxhall has been identified as a settlement in the countryside in the updated settlement hierarchy, and therefore, the Council has looked elsewhere to allocate sites. Further, the site is identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA.
1090	Longfield Nursery, Rectory Road, Stone Common, Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Blaxhall Commons and Open Spaces Charitable Trust	Development of nine houses would represent a 50% increase in the size of the cluster. A public right of way runs along the north-western boundary and development would have an impact on the quality of the landscape.	
1090	Longfield Nursery, Rectory Road, Stone Common, Blaxhall	Housing	Blaxhall	Private individual	Site would need to be cleared to provide visibility for access onto a narrow road.	
1090	Longfield	Housing	Blaxhall	Private	Support one or two self	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Nursery, Rectory Road, Stone Common, Blaxhall			individual	build cottages on the brownfield site in Longfield Nursery.	
475	Land adjacent to Lion House	Housing	Blythburgh	Evolution Town Planning	No clear point of access which means it is difficult to achieve the site as an allocation.	Comments noted, access is identified as an issue and the site is not identified as a preferred site for allocation.
475	Land adjacent to Lion House	Housing	Blythburgh	Blythburgh Parish Council	In Conservation Area and has access issues	These issues are considered in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
504	Hawthorn Farm, Dunwich Road, Blythburgh, IP19 9LT	Housing	Blythburgh	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	The site has not been taken forward as a preferred site as a number of constraints have been identified including; access, landscape impacts, and heritage assets.
797	Part garden of Farthings, London Road and land adjacent	Housing	Blythburgh	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	The site has not been taken forward as a preferred site as a number of constraints have been identified including; access, landscape impacts,

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						heritage assets, and highways impacts.
797	Part garden of Farthings, London Road and land adjacent	Housing	Blythburgh	Blythburgh Parish Council	In Conservation Area but given safe access could have potential.	These issues are considered in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Private individual	Scale of development is the biggest concern, in an area with single track roads, within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, close proximity to designated landscapes and a village with large number of second homes already.	Boyton has been identified as a settlement in the countryside in the updated settlement hierarchy, and therefore, the Council has looked elsewhere to allocate site.
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Private individual	Serious objections relating to flooding, lack of sewage, narrow roads, traffic at Wilford Bridge, little employment, no facilities or recreation space and no street lighting	A number of issues have been identified relating to the site including; access, landscape impacts, biodiversity value, and highways impacts.
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Private individual	Objection based on no infrastructure, poor drainage, flooding, no employment, access to the Peninsula is already busy and the ability for the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					village to absorb a further 20 dwellings.	
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Boyton Parish Council	Wishes to register objection on the following grounds: Density of Housing, Heritage, Sustainability, Physical limits boundary, Access.	
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Private individual	Boyton has barely any facilities, new housing would require infrastructure to bring water, electricity and broadband up to scratch, narrow lanes in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coast.	
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Private individual	Site is not suitable for development, due to flooding, lack of infrastructure, poor roads to access the peninsular and need for protection of natural environment.	
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Private individual	Do not consider site suitable for housing as the number of houses would drastically alter character of village, not facilities in the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					village and a need to use the private motor car, access is via a single track road.	
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Private individual	Objections relate to scale of development out of proportion to existing village, would spoil character of the village, no services or facilities in the village.	
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Private individual	Do not consider the site suitable because the land drains very poorly, small village with no facilities, no public transport and is within the AONB.	
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Private individual	Concerns relate to heritage and design, amenities, topography and parking.	
762	Land South of Boyton Chapel, The Street	Housing	Boyton	Private individual	Object to the proposed site because there are no facilities in the village, everybody needs a car, drainage is an issue and the village is surrounded by open farmland.	
51	Opposite Primary School,	land designation (area to be protected from development)	Bramfield	Clarke and Simpson	Site promoted by landowner for residential	The site is situated entirely within an Area

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Bridge Street				use.	to be Protected from Development and is therefore not considered to be suitable for development.
60	Land opposite Little Orchard, Woodbridge Road, Bredfield	Housing	Bredfield	David Houchell Ltd	Site promoted for residential uses.	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
60	Land opposite Little Orchard, Woodbridge Road, Bredfield	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable or achievable due to the visual impact and threat to change the character of the settlement	Comments noted. Under the SHELAA methodology the site is identified as a potentially suitable site. It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan process, and consideration of impact upon character can form part of that process.
251	Land north of Ufford Road, Bredfield	Tourism	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Site not suitable, available or achievable	Comment noted - Site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA
367	Land south of	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield	Site is available, but not	Site has been identified

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Chapel Farm, Woodbridge Road			Parish Council	suitable for inclusion due to its back-land situation, poor access and potential disturbance of a wildlife site	as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA, however could be considered further through work on the Neighbourhood Plan.
449	Land between Woodbridge Road & Ufford Road, Bredfield	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Site is available, but building in flooding risk area is contrary to the Local Plan and prospect of placing more concrete and brick would potentially increase risk to nearby properties and the presence of industrial and leisure units nearby would overload a small country lane with traffic	Comments noted. Under the SHELAA methodology the site is identified as a potentially suitable site. It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan process, and consideration of the issues identified can form part of that process.
449	Land between Woodbridge Road & Ufford Road, Bredfield	Housing	Bredfield	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted for residential use.	
459	Land Alongside Woodbridge Road	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Available, and suitable and achievable if problems of visibility and hedgerow loss could be resolved	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
534	Land South of	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield	Potentially suitable, if	It is expected that land

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Tudor cottage, East of The Street, Bredfield			Parish Council	suitable access point could be determined – with compensatory planting for lost hedgerow - Listed building setting protected - Removal/relocation of overhead transformers and cables	for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
694	Land West of Woodbridge Road, IP13 6AE	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable, as it would involve the loss of local business, the access point is dangerous and there is possible ground contamination hazard	Comments noted. Under the SHELAA methodology the site is identified as a potentially suitable site. It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan process, and consideration of the issues identified can form part of that process.
694	Land West of Woodbridge Road, IP13 6AE	Housing	Bredfield	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted for residential use	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
695	Land East of	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield	Not suitable due to the	Comments noted. Under

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Woodbridge Road, Bredfield			Parish Council	threat to the character of the village settlement and intrusion onto the street and landscape	the SHELAA methodology the site is identified as a potentially suitable site. It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan process, and consideration of the issues identified can form part of that process.
695	Land East of Woodbridge Road, Bredfield	Housing	Bredfield	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted for residential use	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
696	Land East of Ufford Road, IP13 6AS	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable with poor access road, at the edge of a flood risk area would increase the flood risk locally and the significant impact on the landscape	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
696	Land East of Ufford Road, IP13 6AS	Housing	Bredfield	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted for residential use	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement. It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
696	Land East of Ufford Road, IP13 6AS	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable due to the impact on the landscape and difficulties with traffic which outweigh any advantages	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
696	Land East of Ufford Road, IP13 6AS	Housing	Bredfield	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted for residential use	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
697	Land South of Woodbridge Road, IP13 6AE	Housing	Bredfield	Private individual	Site is outside of the village envelope, if development is permitted the visual approach to Bredfield will be severely compromised.	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
736	The Green Farm, Caters Road, Bredfield	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable due to poor access, single track road, proximity of listed buildings	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					and damage to biodiversity	Neighbourhood Plan.
737	The Green farm, Caters Road, Bredfield	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable as it is detached from the main settlement and would relate poorly to the existing built area and would be an intrusion onto the landscape. The presence of a listed building nearby also detracts from its suitability	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
782	Land opposite Bredfield Place, Dallinghoo Road, IP13 6BD	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable as it is detached from the main settlement and would relate poorly to the existing settlement and would be an intrusion onto the landscape	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
783	Land north of Ivy Lodge, The Street	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable too small	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
784	Land between A12 & Woodbridge Road	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable due to poor access and significant impact on the landscape	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
784	Land between A12 & Woodbridge	Housing	Bredfield	Private individual	Site is outside of the village envelope, if development is permitted the visual	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road				approach to Bredfield will be severely compromised.	Neighbourhood Plan.
891	Land in between Sirocco and Ivy Lodge, The Street	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable too small	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
894	Land west of May Tree Cottage, Caters Lane	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable for inclusion as being too small and with difficult access via a single-track lane	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
944	Land south of Templars	Housing	Bredfield	Bredfield Parish Council	Not suitable due to major impact on street scene and landscape	It is expected that land for housing would be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan.
469	Hunters Heath, Brightwell	Housing	Brightwell	Private individual	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Comments noted. Site identified as potentially suitable through Draft SHELAA but not preferred having regard to Local Plan strategy and development coming forward in the area Brightwell Lakes.
469	Hunters Heath, Brightwell	Housing	Brightwell	Private individual	Site contiguous with Adastral Park will exacerbate the issues further.	
515	Sheepdrift Farm, Brightwell, IP10 OBJ	Housing	Brightwell	Private individual	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Comments noted. Site identified as potentially suitable through Draft SHELAA but not preferred having regard
515	Sheepdrift Farm, Brightwell, IP10	Housing	Brightwell	Private individual	Site contiguous with Adastral Park will	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	OBJ				exacerbate the issues further.	to Local Plan strategy and development comig forward in the area Brightwell Lakes.
515	Sheepdrift Farm, Brightwell, IP10 OBJ	Housing	Brightwell	SCC Highways	Sustainable links to north essential to link to local amenities.	
713	Land South of Adastral Park, Newbourne Road	Housing	Brightwell	Private individual	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Comments noted. Site identified as potentially suitable through Draft SHELAA but not preferred having regard to Local Plan strategy and development comig forward in the area Brightwell Lakes.
713	Land South of Adastral Park, Newbourne Road	Housing	Brightwell	Private individual	Site contiguous with Adastral Park will exacerbate the issues further.	
713	Land South of Adastral Park, Newbourne Road	Housing	Brightwell	SCC Highways	Links to north essential to create sustainable links to amenities.	
731	Bucklesham Road West	Housing	Brightwell	Private Individual	Not acceptable, any development should be close to the school and should incorporate trees as a boundary.	Comment noted. Site in Bucklesham (432) identified as preferred site is closer to the existing built up area, and the policy requires retention of trees and hedgerows.
731	Bucklesham Road West	Housing	Brightwell	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this	Comments noted. Site identified as potentially suitable through Draft SHELAA but not

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	preferred having regard to Local Plan strategy and development comig forward in the area Brightwell Lakes.
731	Bucklesham Road West	Housing	Brightwell	SCC Highways	Footway link to existing footways on Main Rd required. Long distance so may not be feasible.	
732	Bucklesham Road East	Housing	Brightwell	Private Individual	Not acceptable, any development should be close to the school and should incorporate trees as a boundary.	Comment noted. Site in Bucklesham (432) identified as preferred site is closer to the existing built up area, and the policy requires retention of trees and hedgerows.
733	Bucklesham Road North	Housing Office Storage	Brightwell	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Comments noted. Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
733	Bucklesham Road North	Housing Office Storage	Brightwell	SCC Highways	Footway link to existing footways on Main Rd required. Link through adjacent site 732. Long distance so may not be feasible.	
733	Bucklesham	Housing Office Storage	Brightwell	Private	Not acceptable, any	Comment noted. Site in

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road North			Individual	development should be close to the school and should incorporate trees as a boundary.	Bucklesham (432) identified as preferred site is closer to the existing built up area, and the policy requires retention of trees and hedgerows.
733	Bucklesham Road North	Housing Office Storage	Brightwell	Greenways Project	Undeveloped countryside not linked to other development or services.	Noted - site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
132	Land adj to Westward, Summer Lane	Housing	Bromeswell	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Noted, however the site is identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA due to access constraints.
132	Land adj to Westward, Summer Lane	Housing	Bromeswell	Landowner / agent	Amendment to site area submitted. Land promoted for development.	Site amendment made. Site identified as unsuitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment due to significant constraints regarding access.
1069	Land adj. Hill	Housing	Bromeswell	Suffolk	Further assessment is	Comment noted

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Farm, Common Lane, Bromeswell			Wildlife Trust	required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on Bromeswell Green County Wildlife Site.	however site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA.
531	Land to rear of 6 Levington Lane, Bucklesham, IP10 0DZ	Housing	Bucklesham	Artisan PPS Ltd	An obviously acceptable extension to the adjacent area of land to the north where PP has already been granted.	Comment noted. The site is identified as potentially suitable in the SHELAA, however access may be difficult to achieve.
732	Bucklesham Street East	Housing	Bucklesham	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Comments noted, however site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA due to access constraints.
732	Bucklesham Street East	Housing	Bucklesham	SCC Highways	Footway link to existing footways on Main Rd required. Long distance so may not be feasible.	
766	Land south of White House Farm	Housing and Open Space	Bucklesham	Landbridge	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Site identified as suitable in Draft SHELAA however site 432 proposed for allocation was identified as providing a logical

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						extension to the village with few constraints.
1028	Land north of White House, The Street	Housing	Bucklesham	Private individual	Not acceptable, any development should be close to the school and should incorporate trees as a boundary.	Comment noted. Site in Bucklesham (432) identified as preferred site is closer to the existing built up area, and the policy requires retention of trees and hedgerows.
274	Land adjacent to The Cottage, Woodbridge Road	Housing	Burgh	Private individual	The site is adjacent to the River Lark and regularly floods during the winter.	The Draft SHELAA identifies the site as being at risk from flooding, and identifies it as not being a potential site.
453	Former Middle School site, 9 Short Walk, IP12 3NU	Housing	Butley	Butley, Capel St Andrew & Wantisden Parish Council	Parish Could support this site in order to fulfil the outcome of a Housing Needs Survey carried out in June 2008.	Site identified as suitable in the Draft SHELAA however Butley is within the countryside in the settlement hierarchy and the Local Plan is not looking to allocate sites in the countryside.
453	Former Middle School site, 9 Short Walk, IP12 3NU	Housing	Butley	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Site identified as suitable in the Draft SHELAA however Butley is within the countryside

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						in the settlement hierarchy and the Local Plan is not looking to allocate sites in the countryside.
549	Land Between Church Road and B1084	Housing/Open Space	Butley	Capel St Andrew Farms	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Site identified as suitable in the Draft SHELAA however Butley is within the countryside in the settlement hierarchy and the Local Plan is not looking to allocate sites in the countryside.
549	Land Between Church Road and B1084	Housing/Open Space	Butley	SCC Highways	Footway improvements on Church Road. Site is some distance from amenities	Highways issues are identified in the Draft SHELAA.
84	Land adjacent to 35 Mill Lane	Housing	Campsea Ashe	Campsea Ashe Parish Council	Parish Council highlight that the land is not registered.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA
84	Land adjacent to 35 Mill Lane	Housing	Campsea Ashe	Private Individual	Site 84 is more suitable than 422 from environmental point of view and it is closer to the A12.	Comments noted however site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
129	Land at 239 Ashe Row, B1078	Housing	Campsea Ashe	Campsea Ashe Parish Council	Parish Council outline that the owner was unaware that his land had been put	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					forward.	
422	Land to the south of Station Road	Housing	Campsea Ashe	Private Individual	Development of this site would impact on Listed Buildings.	Comments noted. Part of site is identified as a preferred site however policy requires design and layout to reflect location close to Grade II Listed Building. Site 84 identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
422	Land to the south of Station Road	Housing	Campsea Ashe	Private Individuals	Development of this site would impact on Listed Buildings, and also is within a Special Landscape Area. Is located further away from the village than site 84.	
422	land to the south of Station Road	Housing	Campsea Ashe	Clarke & Simpson	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Noted, site is proposed as preferred allocation.
422	land to the south of Station Road	Housing	Campsea Ashe	Landbridge	This land is wrong for development in terms of landscape, impact on neighbouring properties, drainage, access and local services. It would also create an unfortunate precedent in planning terms.	The comments have been considered through the site identification process. Campsea Ashe is identified as a small village in the settlement hierarchy, with potential for some growth, and the site is well related to

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						the station. The policy requires development to reflect the location close to the Grade II Listed Building. A small area of surface water flooding is identified in the northern part of the site and therefore specific reference is included in relation to management of surface water flooding
102	Land adjacent to Charsfield Primary School	Housing/Open Space/Parking	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Development not acceptable Road safety issues. Adjacent to school	Comment noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the Parish are more suitable for allocation.
102	Land adjacent to Charsfield Primary School	Housing/Open Space/Parking	Charsfield	Private individual	Exclude this site.	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however in particular issues related to impact on the setting of Grade I St Peter's Church may be difficult to overcome and therefore site 812 is

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						identified as a preferred site for allocation.
286	Land south of Hill Farm	Housing	Charsfield	Private individual	Objects to the site on issues such as road safety, access, services, environment, biodiversity and elevations.	Comments noted. Suffolk County Council comments suggest that an acceptable access could be achieved, however the site is not proposed for allocation and it may be difficult to overcome impacts on the setting of the church.
286	Land south of Hill Farm	Housing	Charsfield	Private individual	Outline concerns in respect of poor visibility, narrow roads, no pavement and insufficient capacity for services.	
286	Land south of Hill Farm	Housing	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Development not acceptable Road safety issues.	
318	Land at and surrounding Highfields, Davey Lane	Housing	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Plots 318,813 and 814 Total indicative use of 27. Over development. 8 between these three areas: mixed development preferable.	Comment noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
416	land east of St Peter's Church, The Street	Housing	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Development not appropriate bearing in mind the adjacent planning permission for 20. Access not appropriate.	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA
417	land north of The Limes, Church Road	Housing	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Development not appropriate bearing in mind the adjacent planning	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					permission for 20. Access not appropriate.	
418	land to the rear of Rose Cottage, Chapel Lane	Housing	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Not suitable for development	Comment noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
812	Land behind 15 St Peters Close	Housing	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Development not appropriate bearing in mind the adjacent planning permission for 20. Access not appropriate.	The comments have been considered in identifying preferred sites. Charsfield is identified as a small village in the settlement hierarchy with potential for some development. Suffolk County Council have not raised any issues in relation to an access via St Peter's Close.
813	Land adj to Highfields, Davey Lane	Housing	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Plots 318,813 and 814 Total indicative use of 27. Over development. 8 between these three areas: mixed development preferable.	Comment noted. Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
814	Land between Davey Lane and Church Lane	Housing	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Plots 318,813 and 814 Total indicative use of 27. Over development. 8 between these three areas: mixed development preferable.	Comment noted. Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
889	Land North of South Cottage, Chapel Lane	Housing	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Would lead to excessive traffic on Chapel Lane and would detrimentally affect the natural landscape	Comment noted. Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
890	Land South of Springfield House, Chapel Lane	Housing	Charsfield	Charsfield Parish Council	Not suitable for development for reasons previously cited and planning permission refused.	Comment noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the Parish are more suitable for allocation. Furthermore, significant access and highways constraints have been identified.
101	Land opposite The Hawthorns, Chediston Green	Affordable housing	Chediston	SCC Highways	No footways from village. Significant pedestrian infrastructure required. Very narrow road along site frontage.	Comment noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						of the settlement.
541	Land Connected to The Farm Stead, Chediston	Housing	Chediston	Private individual	The site summary states that 1 dwelling has been registered but I had supplied a correction to this showing 3 enhanced sheltered housing units with 3 carer accommodation units. I can supply outline drawings for this if needed.	Comment noted. The scale of the site is not suitable for allocation in the Draft Local Plan (i.e below 0.2ha).
700	Site A, North of Orford Road, IP12 3PS	Housing	Chillesford	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to the Sandlings SPA, Sandlings Forest SSSI and Aldewood Forest CWS. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	Comments noted. Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement. Landscape and environment impacts have been identified through the SHELAA.
700	Site A, North of Orford Road, IP12 3PS	Housing	Chillesford	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						settlement.
701	Site B, South of Orford Road,	Housing	Chillesford	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
702	Site C, North of Orford Road	Housing	Chillesford	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
703	Site D, Land West of Pedlars Lane, Chillesford, IP12 3PS	Housing	Chillesford	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the SHELAA, Chillesford has been identified as a settlement in the countryside in the updated settlement hierarchy, and

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						therefore, the Council has looked elsewhere to allocate sites.
290	Land south Village Hall, Manor Road	Housing	Clopton	SCC Highways	Manor road and Snipe Farm Rd both too narrow to support expected traffic movements	Coment noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of the settlement.
298	Land opposite Potash Cottages, Market Hill	Housing	Clopton	Private individual	Alarmed by proposals because of impact on listed buildings, no amenities or services in the village, localised flooding, road safety and impact on wildlife.	Coment noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of the settlement.
300	Land opposite Peartree Farm, Grundisburgh Road	Housing	Clopton	Private individual	Alarmed by proposals because of impact on listed buildings, no amenities or services in the village, localised flooding, road safety and impact on wildlife.	Coment noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of the settlement.
301	Land opposite Peartree Farm, Grundisburgh	Housing	Clopton	Private individual	Alarmed by proposals because of impact on listed buildings, no amenities or	Coment noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within,

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road				services in the village, localised flooding, road safety and impact on wildlife.	adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of the settlement.
302	Land south Peartree Farm, Grundisburgh Road	Housing	Clopton	Private individual	Alarmed by proposals because of impact on listed buildings, no amenities or services in the village, localised flooding, road safety and impact on wildlife.	Coment noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of the settlement.
241	Land south of 13 Granary Cottages	Housing	Darsham	Darsham Parish Council	Only site the Parish Council consider suitable.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA.
357	Land east of Boundry House, Westleton Road	Housing	Darsham	Private individual	Site not suitable as it would result in huge increase of current population, impact on environment, concern about local infrastructure make this proposal totally inappropriate.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
660	Land East of The Street, Darsham	Housing	Darsham	Darsham Parish Council	A logical infill between Heritage Housing and one of our new small estates. In ten years time, this may	The comments have been taken into account in identifying preferred sites. It is considered

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					become acceptable to the residents of Darsham, but for the reasons given above, not in the near future.	that the site would represent a logical development alongside the Millfields development.
690	Land South of Darsham Station, East of A12, North of Yoxford	Housing	Darsham	Clarke & Simpson	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	The comments have been considered in identifying preferred sites for allocation. The allocation of the site accords with the strategy of the local plan of focusing growth along the A12 corridor and provides opportunities for use of rail travel. The policy requires provision of improvements to pedestrian and cycle connectivity with the station. In terms of environmental impact, the policy SCLP12.44 requires the design and layout of the development to be sympathetic to the setting of Cockfield Hall Park.
690	Land South of Darsham Station, East of A12, North of Yoxford	Housing	Darsham	Darsham Parish Council	All these sites are unacceptable, as they would transform the village into a town some 5 times larger than its size in 2012.	
690	Land South of Darsham Station, East of A12, North of Yoxford	Housing	Darsham	Private individual	Site not suitable as it would result in huge increase of current population, impact on environment, concern about local infrastructure make this proposal totally inappropriate.	
690	Land South of Darsham Station, East of A12, North of Yoxford	Housing	Darsham	SCC Highways	Footway plus widening of Westleton Road required plus ped crossing to continuous footway on A12	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
691	LAND AT THE STREET DARSHAM, IP17 3QF	Housing	Darsham	Darsham Parish Council	All these sites are unacceptable, as they would transform the village into a town some 5 times larger than its size in 2012.	Comments noted. The site has been identified as potential. However, sites elsewhere in the Parish have been identified as more suitable for allocation.
691	LAND AT THE STREET DARSHAM, IP17 3QF	Housing	Darsham	SCC Highways	Link into existing footway on The Street	Highways comments are taken into account in the Draft SHELAA.
692	LAND TO THE EAST OF FOX LANE DARSHAM IP17 3QF	Housing	Darsham	Darsham Parish Council	All these sites are unacceptable, as they would transform the village into a town some 5 times larger than its size in 2012.	Comments noted. Site identified as potential. However, sites elsewhere in the Parish have been identified as more suitable for allocation.
692	LAND TO THE EAST OF FOX LANE DARSHAM IP17 3QF	Housing	Darsham	SCC Highways	Fox lane would require widening plus footway. Low Road unsuitable for access without significant improvement.	Highways comments are taken into account in the Draft SHELAA.
875	Land adjacent 8 Woodbridge Road	Housing	Debach	SCC Highways	No footways present and remote from amenities. Significant improvements required to accommodate this level of development.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft SHELAA as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						the settlement.
62	Land off Laxfield Road	Housing	Dennington	Clarke & Simpson	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Site has been included as proposed allocation due to representing a logical extension which reflects the village form. The site is also well related to the school (and provides an opportunity for land to be reserved for future school uses) and the policy contains criteria related to minimising any impacts on the nearby Listed Buildings and Conservation Area.
62	Land off Laxfield Road	Housing	Dennington	Artisan PPS Ltd	Additional land promoted by neighbouring landowner for residential use.	
860	Land adjacent to Bardolph Cottages, Saxstead Road	Housing	Dennington	Clarke & Simpson	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Comment noted. Site 62 is consider to provide greater benefits and is therefore proposed for allocation.
861	Land to the rear of Dennington Lodge, Laxfield Road	Employment	Dennington	Clarke & Simpson	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Comment noted. Based upon evidence of need the Lcoal Plan allocates strategic scale employment sites elsewhere in the District.
184	Land opposite	Housing	Dunwich	Dunwich	Inappropriate for	Comments noted. Site

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	the Town House Cottages, Westleton Road			Parish Meeting	development. Remote from community and is a natural area used by local people.	identified as unsuitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
184	Land opposite the Town House Cottages, Westleton Road	Housing	Dunwich	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Dunwich Valley Woods and Grassland CWS. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
184	Land opposite the Town House Cottages, Westleton Road	Housing	Dunwich	Private individual	Site not suitable as it is a long way from the village envelope, site is also of interest for wildlife.	
184	Land opposite the Town House Cottages, Westleton Road	Housing	Dunwich	SCC Highways	No footways from village. Significant pedestrian infrastructure required.	
383	Land at Street Farm, Brandeston	Housing	Earl Soham	Landbridge	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Comments noted.The site is not a potential site as it has been

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road, Earl Soham					deemed not within, adjoining or well related to the settlement.
383	Land at Street Farm, Brandeston Road, Earl Soham	Housing	Earl Soham	East Coast Planning Services Ltd	Highly sustainable settlement and support redevelopment of this largely brownfield site for residential use.	
523	Earl Soham Business Centre, to the north of Earl Soham	Housing	Earl Soham	Landbridge	Site promoted by landowner as an extension to existing employment use.	Comments noted. The site has been proposed to the Council as an allocation for residential development. The site is not a potential site as it has been deemed not within, adjoining or well related to the settlement.
321	Land south of Lyndon Cottages, Bakers Hill	Housing	Eastbridge	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site adjacent to Minsmere-Walberswick Heaths & Marshes SSSI. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in these locations is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	Comments noted. Landscape constraints have been identified on the site. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the District are more suitable for allocation.
321	Land south of Lyndon Cottages, Bakers	Housing	Eastbridge	J Hancock and Associates	If developed would create an incursion into open countryside.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Hill					
9	Land adj to The Round Cottage, Framlingham Road	Not specified	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unspecified	Comments noted. The site is below 0.2 hecatres with capacity for 3 homes so is too small for a Draft Local Plan allocation.
9	Land adj to The Round Cottage, Framlingham Road	Not specified	Easton	Private individual	Insufficient space for another dwellings in conservation area.	
63	Land at rear Four Pheasants, The Street	Housing	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unsuitable, within setting of listed buildings and adjacent to conservation area.	The site is not proposed for allocation reflecting comments and the site situation in a locally designated historic park and garden.
63	Land at rear Four Pheasants, The Street	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Access issues, backfill development	
63	Land at rear Four Pheasants, The Street	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Access is through privately owned land.	
97	Land adj to The Round House, Pound Corner	Housing	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unsuitable, outside physical limits boundary and adjacent to area to be protected from development and conservation area.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
97	Land adj to The Round House, Pound Corner	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Access road is already well used on a dangerous blind bend which is not suitable for increase traffic.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
97	Land adj to The Round House, Pound Corner	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Access issues, backfill development	
97	Land adj to The Round House, Pound Corner	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Development is possible but would spoil the outlook of the properties in Framlingham Road.	
404	land west of School Lane	Housing	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unsuitable, outside of physical limits, conservation area and no suitable access.	Site identified as not available in Draft SHELAA
404	land west of School Lane	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Access is only via a single track lane	
404	land west of School Lane	Housing	Easton	Private individual	No appropriate access	
404	land west of School Lane	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Land considerably lower than surrounding fields means site is rather soft and retains moisture	
404	land west of School Lane	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Suitability is limited by very narrow single track road which could not sustain any increase in vehicle movements.	
404	land west of School Lane	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Site is restricted by size of School Land.	
411	land east of Harriers Walk	Housing	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unsuitable, outside physical limits, within historic parkland, no access.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
411	land east of Harriers Walk	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Backfill development with poor access,	
411	land east of Harriers Walk	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Access through privately owned land	
411	land east of Harriers Walk	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Unsuitable for development as within historic park, no suitable access.	
411	land east of Harriers Walk	Housing	Easton	SCC Highways	Unclear how site would link to The Street. Roads such as Harriers Walk may not be suitable for linkage	
463	Cemetery Field, School Lane, Easton	Housing	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unsuitable, outside physical limits, within historic parkland, no access.	Identified as not suitable in Draft SHELAA due to access constraints.
463	Cemetery Field, School Lane, Easton	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Access is only via single track land on higher ground	
463	Cemetery Field, School Lane, Easton	Housing	Easton	Private individual	No proper access to the site	
463	Cemetery Field, School Lane, Easton	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Suitability is limited by very narrow single track road which could not sustain any increase in vehicle movements.	
463	Cemetery Field, School Lane, Easton	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Site previously considered unsuitable by Planning Committee and Local Plan, higher ground would	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					impact residential amenity. Access is not suitable.	
463	Cemetery Field, School Lane, Easton	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Access is only via a single track road.	
516	Land adjacent to The Old Osiers, The Street, IP13 0ED	Housing	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unsuitable, outside physical limits, river valley, would create negative impact on conservation area.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
516	Land adjacent to The Old Osiers, The Street, IP13 0ED	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Hopkins Homes development set precedent, any development should be set back sufficiently from main road.	
730	Next to Car Park, Easton Street	Housing	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unsuitable as site is protected from development within conservation area.	Comments noted. Site is too small for a Draft Local Plan allocation for new housing.
730	Next to Car Park, Easton Street	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Many previous planning applications have been refused on this site.	
730	Next to Car Park, Easton Street	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Site should be considered for providing tourist accommodation.	
730	Next to Car Park, Easton Street	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Currently a valuable village car park, site to be protected from development in Local Plan.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
730	Next to Car Park, Easton Street	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Brewery meadow has been refused permission several times, because it is subject to flooding	
738	Easton Farm Park, Pond Corner	Housing/Retail/Leisure/Holiday/off ice	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Suitable, site is Farm Park, suitable for restrained growth with minimal impact on business related tourism and lesirue.	The site is assessed in supporting employment land evidence as unsuitable due to a lack of access to transport/strategic transport networks and as such is considered to have limited market attractiveness to meet evidenced employment needs.
738	Easton Farm Park, Pond Corner	Housing/Retail/Leisure/Holiday/off ice	Easton	Private individual	Suitable for small scale industrial and residential development.	
739	Sanctuary Field, Pound Corner	Housing/ Holiday Accomidation	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unsuitable, outside of physical limits, adjacent to area to be protected from development, within conservation area and poorly related to village.	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft SHELAA, however it is expected that the Neighbourhood Plan will consider housing allocoations.
739	Sanctuary Field, Pound Corner	Housing/ Holiday Accomidation	Easton	Private individual	Adjacent to conservation area and historic "round-house"	
739	Sanctuary Field, Pound Corner	Housing/ Holiday Accomidation	Easton	Private individual	Access road is already well used on a dangerous blind bend which is not suitable for increase traffic.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
739	Sanctuary Field, Pound Corner	Housing/ Holiday Accomodation	Easton	Private individual	Lower part of the site is subject to flooding.	
740	Kettleburgh Road, Easton	Housing	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unsuitable, outside pf physical limits, listed buildings nearby, no access.	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft SHELAA, however it is expected that the Neighbourhood Plan will consider housing allocoations.
740	Kettleburgh Road, Easton	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Backfill development adjacent to conservation area.	
740	Kettleburgh Road, Easton	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Access road is already well used on a dangerous blind bend which is not suitable for increase traffic.	
740	Kettleburgh Road, Easton	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Development is possible but would spoil the outlook of the properties in Framlingham Road.	
796	Land adj to The Kennels, The Street	Housing	Easton	Easton Parish Council	Unsuitable, outside physical limits, adjacent to area to be protected from development, within conservation area.	Comments noted. Site identified as not suitable in Draft SHELAA due to location in flood zone 3b.
796	Land adj to The Kennels, The Street	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Flood plain	
796	Land adj to The Kennels, The Street	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Totally unsuitable as within floodplain.	
796	Land adj to The Kennels, The	Housing	Easton	Private individual	Site is often flooded.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Street					
796	Land adj to The Kennels, The Street	Housing	Easton	SCC Highways	Footway along frontage and link to existing footway required. Potential requirement for 30mph speed limit extension.	
279	Land South of Manor Cottages, Castle Hill	Housing	Eyke	Smith Jenkins	Access issues and site would represent notable extrusion of village to the north.	Comments noted however site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
280	Land rear of The Old Mill House, The Street	Housing	Eyke	Smith Jenkins	Site is remote from village and there are likely to be highways issues.	Comments noted however site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
423	Church Farm, Eyke	Housing / Open space	Eyke	Smith Jenkins	Access issues and impact on the AONB.	Comments noted. Site 423 is not identified as a proposed allocation.
776	Land to the south of Eyke CoE Primary School and East of The Street	Housing / car park / open space	Eyke	Smith Jenkins	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify negative effects against objective to improve quality of life where people live and work.	Sustainability Appraisal of First Draft Local Plan does not identify negative effects against this objective.
776	Land to the south of Eyke	Housing/Car Park/Open Space	Eyke	Smith Jenkins	Site promoted by landowner for residential	Site is identified as a preferred site. Eyke is

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	CoE Primary School and East of The Street				use.	identified as a small village however the site provides opportunities to secure benefits for the school and the community.
776	Land to the south of Eyke CoE Primary School and East of The Street	Housing/Car Park/Open Space	Eyke	Landbridge	Site promoted by landowner for residential use with extension to school car park and village open space.	
777	Land to the west of The Street, Eyke	Housing/Open Space	Eyke	Smith Jenkins	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Comment noted. Site identified as a potential site. However, site 776 has been identified as more suitable for allocation due to scope for greater benefits.
777	Land to the west of The Street, Eyke	Housing / open space	Eyke	Smith Jenkins	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify negative effects against objective to improve quality of life where people live and work.	Sustainability Appraisal of First Draft Local Plan does not identify negative effects against this objective.
67	Land adj The Old Dog, Lower Falkenham Road	Housing	Falkenham	Private individual	One property would not have a major effect but it may on the people around and this should be taken into serious consideration.	Comment noted. Site has not been made available for allocation.
976	Land at Kirton Road	Housing	Falkenham	Kirton and Falkenham Parish	Sustainability Appraisal should identify negative effects for transport and	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft Strategic Housing and

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
				Council	landscape.	Economic Land Availability Assessment and therefore Sustainability Appraisal has not been undertaken.
976	Land at Kirton Road, Falkenham	Housing	Falkenham	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	STRONGLY NEGATIVE. Ribbon development which would significantly link Kirton & Falkenham, adversely affecting their different characters. Loss of high quality agricultural land.	Comments noted. Site identified as not potential as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to a settlement and is therefore not suitable for allocation.
976	Land at Kirton Road, Falkenham	Housing	Falkenham	Private individual	Objection on grounds of access/traffic/parking/road safety.	
144	Haven Exchange, Walton Avenue	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Brownfield site more central to the town should be considered for development.	Site identified as suitable, but would lead to loss of allocated employment land.
144	Haven Exchange Site, Walton Avenue	Housing	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Sustainable links to north required	This site is allocated in the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan (policy FPP12).
623	land at The Forum Centre, Sea Road	Mixed use	Felixstowe	Private individual	Development at Sea Road is ridiculous as it will tower over its neighbours and breaches policy on	Comment noted. Draft SHELAA identifies site as not available.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					affordable housing.	
624	land at Mannings Amusement Park, Sea Road	Mixed use	Felixstowe	Private individual	Development at Sea Road is ridiculous as it will tower over its neighbours and breaches policy on affordable housing.	Comment noted. Draft SHELAA identifies site as not available.
625	land at Felixstowe Sundry Market site, Sea Road	Mixed use	Felixstowe	Private individual	Development at Sea Road is ridiculous as it will tower over its neighbours and breaches policy on affordable housing.	Comment noted. Draft SHELAA identifies site as not available.
625	Land at Felixstowe Sunday Market site, Sea Road	Mixed use	Felixstowe	Private individual	Planning application in for mixed use development.	Site is allocated in Felixstowe Area Action Plan and is proposed to be carried forward in to the new Local Plan under policy SCLP12.9.
631	Land adjacent to Laurel Farm, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Site adjacent to AONB and there should be no further development in this area.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
631	Land adjacent to Laurel Farm, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Good grade agricultural land adjacent to AONB.	Comment noted. Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment identifies site as not available.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
631	Land adjacent to Laurel Farm, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Should not be built on, as this land is Felixstowe's last remaining green fields	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
631	Land adjacent to Laurel Farm, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Overlooks AONB and inappropriate for development, lack of infrastructure and loss of agricultural land.	Comment noted. Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment identifies site as not available.
631	Land adjacent to Laurel Farm, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Our very last areas of accessible countryside and close to the ANOB. They are too far from facilities.	Comment noted. Draft SHELAA identifies site as not available.
631	Land adjacent to Laurel Farm, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Widening of Ferry Road (and potentially Marsh Lane) plus footways required	
633	Land at and surrounding Fleet House, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Good grade agricultural land adjacent to AONB.	Comment noted. Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment identifies site as not available.
633	Land at and surrounding Fleet House,	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Site adjacent to AONB and there should be no further development in this area.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Marsh Lane					Economic Land Availability Assessment
633	Land at and surrounding Fleet House, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Overlooks AONB and inappropriate for development, lack of infrastructure and loss of agricultural land.	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
633	Land at and surrounding Fleet House, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Should not be built on, as this land is Felixstowe's last remaining green fields	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
633	Land at and surrounding Fleet House, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Our very last areas of accessible countryside and close to the AONB. They are too far from facilities.	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA
633	Land at and surrounding Fleet House, Marsh Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Widening of Ferry Road (and potentially Marsh Lane) plus footways required	
644	Land at Candlet Road	Housing Care Home Open Space Office	Felixstowe	Felixstowe Town Council	Outline planning permission granted	Comments noted. Site has outline planning permission. Additionally, the site is part of the preferred site, site allocation SCLP12.3.
644	Land at Candlet	Housing, care home, open space,	Felixstowe	Private	No consideration appears	Comments noted. Site

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road	office		individual	to be given to the aesthetic appearance and the beauty of this area. This type of urban sprawl development takes no account of the impact on the area for generations to come and creates an environment no one actually wants to live in. Crossing the boundary of the A14 will lead to further infill development, once this landscape is lost it is gone forever	has outline planning permission. Additionally, the site is part of the preferred site, site allocation SCLP12.3.
644	Land at Candlet Road	Housing, care home, open space, office	Felixstowe	Richard Brown Planning Limited	Site promoted by landowner for a residential mixed use development.	
644	Land at Candlet Road	Housing, care home, open space, office	Felixstowe	Private individual	Areas should be sacrosanct and clearly marked as not for development of any kind.	
644	Land at Candlet Road	Housing, care home, open space, office	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	No further comments - site subject to recent planning process.	
750	Land north of Candlet Road	Housing and Open Space	Felixstowe	Trinity College, Cambridge	Land promoted for development	Site proposed for allocation as part of North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
750	Land north of Candlet Road	Housing and Open Space	Felixstowe	Private individual	Should not be built on, as this land is Felixstowe's last remaining green fields	Site proposed for allocation as part of North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood
750	Land north of Candlet Road	Housing and Open Space	Felixstowe	Private individual	Development of this site seems a sensible longer term approach.	The site forms part of the proposed North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood.
750	Land North of Candlet Road	Housing and Open Space	Felixstowe	Private individual	No consideration appears to be given to the aesthetic appearance and the beauty of this area. This type of urban sprawl development takes no account of the impact on the area for generations to come and creates an environment no one actually wants to live in. Crossing the boundary of the A14 will lead to further infill development, once this landscape is lost it is gone forever	Consideration has been given to comments received in identifying preferred sites. The area to the north of Felixstowe is identified as a key part of the Local Plan strategy for the delivery of a Garden Neighbourhood. The area would be developed around the principles of green infrastructure and would enable provision of improved leisure facilities for Felixstowe. The Garden Neighbourhood would include services and facilities within the site.
750	Land North of Candlet Road	Housing and Open Space	Felixstowe	Private individual	Represents a serious encroachment beyond a defined boundary onto prime farmland which borders the AONB. A rural area would become	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					urbanised and unique habitat, landscape and productive farmland will be lost. The local infrastructure including roads, schools and sewerage will be overloaded by such a large development.	The provision of significant green areas in the northern part of the site, which would provide a buffer with the AONB, are a fundamental element of the indicative draft masterplan. Access considered as part of wider North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood.
750	Land North of Candlet Road	Housing and Open Space	Felixstowe	Private individual	Our very last areas of accessible countryside and close to the AONB. They are too far from facilities.	
750	Land North of Candlet Road	Housing and Open Space	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Adjacent to Candlet Road site (allowed by SoS). No vehicular access from Gulpher Road as this is a quiet lane. Likely to require a link off the HE A14(T) road at Dock Spur roundabout or a link off the proposed roundabout on Candlet Road, would require multiple access points due to size. Candlet Track is a bridleway and forms the northern boundary of the site. Access for sustainable modes via link road to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Walton High Street provided by the Walton North site. Also via Gulpher Road for walking and cycling links.	
759	Land west of Port of Felixstowe Road	Housing and Open Space	Felixstowe	Private individual	Development of this site seems a sensible longer term approach.	Site identified as unsuitable as it is entirely within a designated Area to be Protected from Development.
759	Land west of Port of Felixstowe Road	Housing and Open Space	Felixstowe	Private individual	Site much more suited for development.	Site identified as unsuitable as it is entirely within a designated Area to be Protected from Development.
800	Land adj playing field, Quintons Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Site adjacent to AONB and there should be no further development in this area.	Consideration has been given to comments received in identifying preferred sites. The area to the north of Felixstowe is identified as a key part of the Local Plan strategy for the delivery of a Garden Neighbourhood. The area would be developed around the
800	Land adj playing field, Quintons Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Good grade agricultural land adjacent to AONB.	
800	Land adj playing field, Quintons Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Overlooks AONB and inappropriate for development, lack of infrastructure and loss of agricultural land.	
800	Land adj playing	Housing	Felixstowe	Private	Land should not be built on	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	field, Quintons Lane			individual	as it is Felixstowe's last remaining green fields	principles of green infrastructure and would enable provision of improved leisure facilities for Felixstowe. The Garden Neighbourhood would include services and facilities within the site. The provision of significant green areas in the northern part of the site, which would provide a buffer with the AONB, are a fundamental element of the indicative draft masterplan.
800	Land adj playing field, Quintons Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Felixstowe Town Council	Only as part of a carefully and strategically planned development, well-related to the town and its links with Plot 644 which has Outline permission for 570 homes	
800	Land adj to playing field, Quinton's Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Our very last areas of accessible countryside and close to the ANOB. They are too far from facilities.	
800	Land adj to playing field,	Housing	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Approach roads very narrow without footways.	to the north of Felixstowe is identified

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Quinton's Lane				Significant improvements required.	as a key part of the Local Plan strategy for the delivery of a Garden Neighbourhood. The area would be developed around the principles of green infrastructure and would enable provision of improved leisure facilities for Felixstowe. The Garden Neighbourhood would include services and facilities within the site. The provision of significant green areas in the northern part of the site, which would provide a buffer with the AONB, are a fundamental element of the indicative draft masterplan. Access considered as part of wider North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood.
801	Land adj to park	Physical limits extension	Felixstowe	Felixstowe	Only as part of a carefully	Consideration has been

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Farm, Hyem's Lane			Town Council	and strategically planned development, well-related to the town and its links with Plot 644 which has Outline permission for 570 homes	given to comments received in identifying preferred sites. The area to the north of Felixstowe is identified as a key part of the Local Plan strategy for the delivery of a Garden Neighbourhood. The area would be developed around the principles of green infrastructure and would enable provision of improved leisure facilities for Felixstowe. The Garden Neighbourhood would include services and facilities within the site. The provision of significant green areas in the northern part of the site, which would provide a buffer with the AONB, are a fundamental element of the indicative draft masterplan.
801	Land adj to park Farm, Hyem's Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Site adjacent to AONB and there should be no further development in this area.	
801	Land adj to park Farm, Hyem's Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Land should not be built on as it is Felixstowe's last remaining green fields	
801	Land adj to park Farm, Hyem's Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Good grade agricultural land adjacent to AONB.	
801	Land adj to park Farm, Hyem's Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Overlooks AONB and inappropriate for development, lack of infrastructure and loss of agricultural land.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
801	Land adj to park Farm, Hyem's Lane	Physical limits extension	Felixstowe	Private individual	Our very last areas of accessible countryside and close to the ANOB. They are too far from facilities.	Consideration has been given to comments received in identifying preferred sites. The area to the north of Felixstowe is identified as a key part of the Local Plan strategy for the delivery of a Garden Neighbourhood. The area would be developed around the principles of green infrastructure and would enable provision of improved leisure facilities for Felixstowe. The Garden Neighbourhood would include services and facilities within the site. The provision of significant green areas in the northern part of the site, which would

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						provide a buffer with the AONB, are a fundamental element of the indicative draft masterplan.
802	Land beind Upperfield Drive	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Site adjacent to AONB and there should be no further development in this area.	Consideration has been given to comments received in identifying preferred sites. The area to the north of Felixstowe is identified as a key part of the Local Plan strategy for the delivery of a Garden Neighbourhood. The area would be developed around the principles of green infrastructure and would enable provision of improved leisure facilities for Felixstowe. The Garden Neighbourhood would include services and facilities within the site.
802	Land beind Upperfield Drive	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Good grade agricultural land adjacent to AONB.	
802	Land beind Upperfield Drive	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Land should not be built on as it is Felixstowe's last remaining green fields	
802	Land beind Upperfield Drive	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Overlooks AONB and inappropriate for development, lack of infrastructure and loss of agricultural land.	
802	Land beind Upperfield Drive	Housing	Felixstowe	Felixstowe Town Council	Only as part of a carefully and strategically planned development, well-related to the town and its links with Plot 644 which has Outline permission for 570 homes	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						The provision of significant green areas in the northern part of the site, which would provide a buffer with the AONB, are a fundamental element of the indicative draft masterplan.
802	Land behind Upperfield Drive	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Our very last areas of accessible countryside and close to the ANOB. They are too far from facilities.	Consideration has been given to comments received in identifying preferred sites. The area to the north of Felixstowe is identified as a key part of the Local Plan strategy for the delivery of a Garden Neighbourhood. The area would be developed around the principles of green infrastructure and would enable provision of improved leisure facilities for Felixstowe. The Garden Neighbourhood would

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						include services and facilities within the site. The provision of significant green areas in the northern part of the site, which would provide a buffer with the AONB, are a fundamental element of the indicative draft masterplan.
802	Land behind Upperfield Drive	Housing	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Assessment of whether residential approach road (upperfield Drive) could accommodate additional traffic flows required	Access considered as part of wider North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood.
935	Peewit & Felixstowe Beach Caravan Park	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Brownfield site more central to the town should be considered for development.	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
935	Peewit & Felixstowe Beach Caravan Park, Walton Avenue	Housing	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Improved access onto A154 required plus links to north of site. Potentially ped crossing facilities	Comment noted.Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA
936	Land at Suffolk Sand Holiday	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Brownfield site more central to the town should	Comment noted. Draft Strategic Housing and

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Park				be considered for development.	Economic Land Availability Assessment identifies the site as not being available.
936	land at Suffolk Sands Holiday Park, Carr Road	Housing	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Sustainable links to north of site. Potentially ped crossing facilities	Comment noted. Draft SHELAA identifies the site as not being available.
941	Land at Deben High School	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Brownfield site more central to the town should be considered for development.	Comment noted. Site identified as potential but subject to consideration of loss of community uses, and therefore not proposed for allocation.
941	Land at Deben High School	Housing	Felixstowe	Felixstowe Town Council	Former High School, well related to the town	Identified as a potentially suitable site however is currently in use for education purposes.
941	Land at Deben High School	Housing	Felixstowe	Private individual	Site much more suited for development.	Identified as a potentially suitable site however is currently in use for education purposes.
941	Land at Deben High School	Housing	Felixstowe	Felixstowe Town Council	Land at the old Deben school to provide new education facilities.	Land at Deben High School included as site 941, promoted for Housing, and is currently

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						in use for education purposes.
941	Land at Deben High School, Garrison Lane	Housing	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Main access onto Garrison Lane - A154	Comment noted. Site identified as potential but subject to consideration of loss of community uses, and therefore not proposed for allocation.
1023	Land at Anzani House, Anzani Avenue, Felixstowe	Housing	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Within port area. Would require sustainable links to local amenities	Site has prior notification approval for housing under Permitted Development rights.
1091	Brackenbury Sports Centre	Not Specified	Felixstowe	Felixstowe Town Council	Could provide housing if local re-provision of leisure facilities guaranteed	Proposed for housing allocation alongside provision of new leisure centre as part of North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood.
1092	Eastward Ho, Grove Road	Leisure/housing/commercial	Felixstowe	Private individual	Good grade agricultural land adjacent to AONB.	Consideration has been given to comments received in identifying preferred sites. The area to the north of Felixstowe is identified as a key part of the Local Plan strategy for the delivery of a Garden

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						Neighbourhood. The area would be developed around the principles of green infrastructure and would enable provision of improved leisure facilities for Felixstowe. Access to be considered in relation to development of whole Garden Neighbourhood.
1092	Eastward Ho, Grove Road	Leisure/housing/commercial	Felixstowe	Private individual	No consideration appears to be given to the aesthetic appearance and the beauty of this area. This type of urban sprawl development takes no account of the impact on the area for generations to come and creates an environment no one actually wants to live in. Crossing the boundary of the A14 will lead to further infill development, once this landscape is lost it is gone forever	Consideration has been given to comments received in identifying preferred sites. The area to the north of Felixstowe is identified as a key part of the Local Plan strategy for the delivery of a Garden Neighbourhood. The area would be developed around the principles of green infrastructure and would enable provision of improved leisure facilities for Felixstowe.
1092	Eastward Ho, Grove Road	Leisure/housing/commercial	Felixstowe	Private individual	Areas should be sacrosanct and clearly marked as not	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					for development of any kind.	Access to be considered in relation to development of whole Garden Neighbourhood.
1092	Eastward Ho, Grove Road	Leisure/housing/commercial	Felixstowe	SCC Highways	Access from roundabout at south western corner of site. Capacity improvements may be required to roundabout.	
335	Land at and to rear of High Trees, Oakhurst and Molen, Bucklesham Road	Housing	Foxhall	SCC Highways	No footways on Bucklesham Road	Comment noted. Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft SHELAA, Foxhall is identified as in the countryside in the settlement hierarchy. The Local Plan Strategy avoids allocating development in the countryside.
485	Land North & South of Bucklesham Road, IP10 0AG	Mixed	Foxhall	Private Individual	Development of this site would cause traffic issues and merge Foxhall and Bucklesham.	Comment noted. Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, Foxhall is identified as in the countryside in the settlement hierarchy.
485	Land North & South of Bucklesham Road, IP10 0AG	Mixed	Foxhall	Greenways Project	Not linked to services and in prominent position.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						The Local Plan Strategy avoids allocating development in the countryside. Development of this scale in this location would not reflect the strategy of the Local Plan.
485	Land North & South of Bucklesham Road, IP10 0AG	Mixed	Foxhall	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Sites represent a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Comment noted. Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft SHELAA, Foxhall is identified as in the countryside in the settlement hierarchy. The Local Plan Strategy avoids allocating development in the countryside. Development of this scale in this location would not reflect the strategy of the Local Plan.
485	Land North & South of Bucklesham Road, IP10 0AG	Mixed	Foxhall	SCC Highways	It is not clear how this site would be accessed as the Bucklesham Road currently has no junction with the A12. It is unlikely that a new junction would be	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					supported on the A14(T) or A12, due to the proximity to Seven Hills roundabout.	
522	Foxhall Stadium, land on Foxhall Heath	Housing, open space	Foxhall	Private individual	Exclude this site from development.	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – significant landscape and biodiversity issues.
522	Foxhall Stadium, land on Foxhall Heath	Housing, open space	Foxhall	Greenways Project	County Wildlife Site and TPOs. Recreation value.	
522	Foxhall Stadium, land on Foxhall Heath	Housing, open space	Foxhall	Private individual	This site is even more distant from local facilities	Comments noted. Site identified as not potential due to significant landscape and biodiversity constraints.
522	Foxhall Stadium, land on Foxhall Heath	Housing, open space	Foxhall	Turnberry Planning Ltd	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	
522	Foxhall Stadium, land on Foxhall Heath	Housing, open space	Foxhall	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is within Foxhall Stadium Wood CWS and development would therefore result in a loss of CWS.	
522	Foxhall Stadium, land on Foxhall Heath	Housing, open space	Foxhall	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Not to be developed owing to massive loss of Woodlands and open areas and loss of sporting facility. The road is not sustainable for development.	
522	Foxhall Stadium,	Housing, open space	Foxhall	SCC	Site is currently only	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	land on Foxhall Heath			Highways	accessed from an Unadopted Road with poor visibility due to road alignment and would not be suitable for an intensification of use.	
765	Land North of Bucklesham Road	Retail/Office/General industry/Storage	Foxhall	Private Individual	Development of this site would cause traffic issues and merge Foxhall and Bucklesham.	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, Foxhall is identified as in the countryside in the settlement hierarchy. The Local Plan Strategy avoids allocating development in the countryside.
765	Land North of Bucklesham Road	Retail/Office/General industry/Storage	Foxhall	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Sites represent a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft SHELAA, Foxhall is identified as in the countryside in the settlement hierarchy. The Local Plan Strategy avoids allocating

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	development in the countryside.
765	Land North of Bucklesham Road	Retail/Office/General industry/Storage	Foxhall	Landbridge	Site promoted for mixed use commercial development by landowner.	
977	Foxhall landfill site, Foxhall Road	Employment	Foxhall	Greenways Project	After use is supposed to be for nature conservation.	Noted, however site has been assessed as potentially suitable for employment uses albeit not proposed for allocation.
977	Foxhall landfill site, Foxhall Road, Foxhall	Foxhall landfill site, Foxhall Road, Foxhall	Foxhall	SCC Highways	Improvements to access junction onto Foxhall Road. Potentially right turn lane.	Comment noted. Site identified as potential. However, sites elsewhere in the District have been deemed more suitable for allocation to meet evidenced employment needs.
261	Land north of Kings Avenue	Housing / expansion of school grounds	Framlingham	Scott Properties	Site promoted for development.	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potentially suitable site in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, the Council

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						would expect a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan to cover the period to 2036.
393	Charnwood Field, Rose Farm, Framlingham	Housing,Retail,Business & office,Storage	Framlingham	Private individual	Site promoted by the landowner for residential use.	Whilst the site is identified as a potentially suitable site in the Draft SHELAA, the Council would expect a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan to cover the period to 2036.
428	land at Hill Farm, Kettleburgh Road	mixed use	Framlingham	Private individual	Object to site because it is outside of the physical limits boundary identified in the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan, green field site, impact on settlement fringe, site is not served by good road access and would impact on existing roads and junctions.	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potentially suitable site in the Draft SHELAA, the Council would expect a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan to cover the period to 2036.
428	land at Hill Farm, Kettleburgh Road	Mixed use	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Footway upgrades on adjacent roads required and improved ped links to town	Highways comments addressed through the Draft SHELAA.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
526	Land fronting New Street, south of Saxtead road, Framlingham	Housing, education/primary school, public recreation, surgery & community use	Framlingham	Landbridge	Site promoted by the landowner for residential use.	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potentially suitable site in the Draft SHELAA, the Council would expect a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan to cover the period to 2036.
528	Land fronting New Street, south of Saxtead road, Framlingham	Housing	Framlingham	Landbridge	Site promoted by the landowner for residential use.	Now included as part of site 526.
528	Land fronting New Street, south of Saxtead road, Framlingham	Housing	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Improvements to sustainable routes from site to town centre required	
529	Land fronting New Street, south of Saxtead road, Framlingham	Housing	Framlingham	Landbridge	Site promoted by the landowner for residential use.	Now included as part of site 526.
529	Land fronting New Street, south of Saxtead road,	Housing	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Improvements to sustainable routes from site to town centre required	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Framlingham					
547	Land at Dennington Road, North of Thomas Mills High School	Housing/Care Home/Education/Open Space	Framlingham	Scott Properties	Site promoted for residential use.	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potentially suitable site in the Draft SHELAA, the Council would expect a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan to cover the period to 2036.
547	Land at Dennington Road, North of Thomas Mills High School	Housing/Care Home/Education/Open Space	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Access from Dennington Road	
676	Countess Wells Pig Unit, New Road	Housing	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Site is remote from Framlingham. New Road would require significant improvement.	Comment noted. The Draft SHELAA identifies that the site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the settlement.
677	Field off B1120 on Northern Road out of Framlingham	Housing	Framlingham	Historic England	Any development on this side of the town is likely to have an adverse and harmful impact on the Great Park. Site 677 would be significantly harmful to the significance of Framlingham Castle and Framlingham Conservation Area and should not be taken forward.	Site is identified as not suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment due to potential impacts on historic environment.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
677	Field off B1120 on Northern Road out of Framlingham	Housing	Framlingham	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Framlingham Mere CWS and Framlingham Mere SWT Reserve. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	Comments noted. The site is not a potential site in the Draft SHELAA as a result of significant landscape constraints. Highways comments are addressed through the Draft SHELAA.
677	Field off B1120 on Northern Road out of Framlingham	Housing	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Footway widening on B1120 towards town centre. Improvements to sustainable links into town centre.	
741	Coldhall Lane, Saxmundham Road	Housing	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Consideration should be given to whether these sites (741-9) could link between Fairfield Road and Saxmundham Road, thus providing an alternative route to the town centre. This may mitigate the impact of the sites on the town centre.	Comment noted. The site is not a potential site in the Draft SHELAA as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the settlement.
742	Coldhall Lane, Saxmundham Road	Housing	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Consideration should be given to whether these sites (741-9) could link between Fairfield Road and	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potentially suitable site in the Draft SHELAA, the

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Saxmundham Road, thus providing an alternative route to the town centre. This may mitigate the impact of the sites on the town centre.	Council would expect a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan to cover the period to 2036.
743	Infirmery Lane, Framlingham	Housing	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Consideration should be given to whether these sites (741-9) could link between Fairfield Road and Saxmundham Road, thus providing an alternative route to the town centre. This may mitigate the impact of the sites on the town centre.	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potentially suitable site in the Draft SHELAA, the Council would expect a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan to cover the period to 2036.
745	East of Woodbridge Road	Housing/Retail/leisure/Office/Storage	Framlingham	Private individual	Would have adverse impact on the landscape and settlement setting as this would result in development up and along the river valley sides to the high ground. It would also impact adversely on the gateway and rural arrival to the town from Woodbridge road, impacting on the character and identity of Fairfield road.	Comments noted. The site is not a potential site as it is an employment allocation in the made Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
745	East of Woodbridge Road	Housing/Retail/leisure/Office/Storage	Framlingham	Private individual	Allocation for mixed use would allow larger employers to look at Framlingham as a possible site for investment that could provide higher value jobs as a result of increase spending in the town.	
745	East of Woodbridge Road	Housing/Retail/leisure/Office/Storage	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Consideration should be given to whether these sites (741-9) could link between Fairfield Road and Saxmundham Road, thus providing an alternative route to the town centre. This may mitigate the impact of the sites on the town centre.	
746	Fairfield Road South	Housing/Retail/Leisure/Office	Framlingham	Private individual	Would have adverse impact on the landscape and settlement setting as this would result in development up and along the river valley sides to the high ground. It would also impact adversely on the gateway and rural arrival to the town from Woodbridge road, impacting on the	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potentially suitable site in the Draft SHELAA, the Council would expect a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan to cover the period to 2036.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					character and identity of Fairfield road.	
746	Fairfield Road South	Housing/Retail/Leisure/Office	Framlingham	Private individual	Allocation for mixed use would allow larger employers to look at Framlingham as a possible site for investment that could provide higher value jobs as a result of increase spending in the town.	
746	Fairfield Road South	Housing/Retail/Leisure/Office	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Consideration should be given to whether these sites (741-9) could link between Fairfield Road and Saxmundham Road, thus providing an alternative route to the town centre. This may mitigate the impact of the sites on the town centre.	
747	Brick Lane, Framlingham	Housing/Holiday Accommodation/Office	Framlingham	Private individual	Local Plan should look to reuse the site and create some new residential units and holiday accommodation to support tourism in the District.	Comment noted. The site Draft SHELAA identifies the site as not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to a settlement.
748	Cole's Green, Brick Lane	Housing/Holiday Accommodation/Office	Framlingham	Private individual	Local Plan should look to reuse the site and create	Comment noted. The Draft SHELAA identifies

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					some new residential units and holiday accommodation to support tourism in the District.	the site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to a settlement.
749	Brick Lane, Framlingham	Housing/Primary School	Framlingham	Private individual	Would have adverse impact on the landscape and settlement setting as this would result in development up and along the river valley sides to the high ground. It would also impact adversely on the gateway and rural arrival to the town from Woodbridge road, impacting on the character and identity of Fairfield road.	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potentially suitable site in the Draft SHELAA, the Council would expect a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan to cover the period to 2036.
749	Brick Lane, Framlingham	Housing/Primary School	Framlingham	Private individual	Allocation for mixed use would allow larger employers to look at Framlingham as a possible site for investment that could provide higher value jobs as a result of increase spending in the town.	
749	Brick Lane, Framlingham	Housing/Primary School	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Consideration should be given to whether these sites (741-9) could link	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					between Fairfield Road and Saxmundham Road, thus providing an alternative route to the town centre. This may mitigate the impact of the sites on the town centre.	
942	Lucarne, Fore St	Housing	Framlingham	Private individual	Intention that land continues to be used as allotments, only other option potential option would be an extension to the cemetery. Do not agree with the designation of the site for residential uses.	Comment noted. Site identified as not available through the Draft SHELAA.
1033	Land opposite 25-33 New Road, Framlingham	Housing	Framlingham	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Framlingham Mere CWS and Framlingham Mere SWT Reserve. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	Comment noted. The site has been identified as not potential due to site size below the 0.2ha threshold.
1050	Land at and behind 115 College Road, Framlingham	Housing	Framlingham	SCC Highways	Improvements to local sustainable routes to town centre	Comment noted. The Draft SHELAA identifies the site as not available.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
496	Land at Grove Road Friston	Housing	Friston	Brown & Co	Site promoted by landowner for residential use with plots gifted to Alde & Ore Estuary Partnership to facilitate continued upgrading and maintenance of flood defences.	Comments noted. The site is identified as a potential site. However, Friston is identified as in the countryside in the settlement hierarchy. The Local Plan Strategy avoids allocating development in the countryside.
496	Land at Grove Road Friston	Housing	Friston	Savills	Site submitted from the centre of the village and its facilities. Development on this site would encroach on the countryside.	
548	land South of Snape Road	Housing	Friston	Blackheath Estate	Land promoted for development	Site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
548	land South of Snape Road	Housing	Friston	SCC Highways	Footway and ped crossing on B1069 required	Comments addressed through draft SHELAA.
550	Land West of Saxmundham Road, Friston	Housing/Open Space	Friston	Savills	Site promoted by landowner for residential use	Comments noted. The site is identified as a potential site. However, Friston is identified as in the countryside in the settlement hierarchy. The Local Plan Strategy avoids allocating development in the
550	Land West of Saxmundham Road, Friston	Housing/Open Space	Friston	SCC Highways	Improvements to footway on B1121 required	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						countryside.
876	Land to the rear of Orchard Bank, Church Road	Housing	Friston	Savills	Site in close proximity to Listed Buildings and therefore any development on this site would need to mitigate any negative impact on these buildings.	Comment noted. Site identified as not available in Draft SHELAA.
6	Land adj to Ivy Cottage, Boot Street	Housing	Great Bealings	Artisan PPS td	Site promoted by landowner for residential use	Comment noted. The site has been identified as not potential in the Draft SHELAA as it is below the size threshold for allocation within the First Draft Local Plan. Furthermore, the Council supports the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for delivering further development in alignment with the countryside policies in the Draft Local Plan.
635	Land at Kiln Farm, Kiln Lane	Housing	Great Bealings	Artisan PPS td	Site promoted by landowner for residential use	Comment noted. The site has been identified as not potential in the Draft SHELAA. Furthermore, the Council supports the
635	Land at Kiln Farm, Kiln Lane	Housing	Great Bealings	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Kiln Farm Meadow CWS. Further assessment is required to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for delivering further development in alignment with the countryside policies in the Draft Local Plan.
1064	Land at and around Sandpit Cottages, Low Road	Housing	Great Glemham	SCC Highways	Lack of footways on adjacent roads. Narrow roads unlikely to be able to accommodate traffic from this level of development.	Comment noted. Comments addressed through Draft SHELAA.
24	Land at recreation ground South of Post Mill Orchard and Post Mill Close	Recreation	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in Grundisburgh have been identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
24	Land at recreation ground South of Post Mill Orchard and Post Mill Close	Recreation	Grundisburgh	Grundisburgh Parish Council	Not suitable	
56	Land at and surrounding 22-24 Stoney Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in Grundisburgh have been
56	Land at and surrounding 22-	Housing	Grundisburgh	Grundisburgh Parish	Not suitable	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	24 Stoney Road			Council		identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
56	Land at and surrounding 22-24 Stoney Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	I would support development in plot 56	Comment noted. Site identified as not available in Draft SHELAA.
57	Land at and surrounding 26 Stoney Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in Grundisburgh have been identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
57	Land at and surrounding 26 Stoney Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Grundisburgh Parish Council	Not suitable	
57	Land at and surrounding 26 Stoney Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	I would support development in plot 57	Comment noted. Site identified as not available in Draft SHELAA.
127	land between the Street and Meeting Lane	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in Grundisburgh have been identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
127	land between	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private	Grundisburgh allotments	Comment noted. Site

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	the Street and Meeting Lane			individual	are a valuable asset to the villagers of Grundisburgh, particularly those with no opportunity to grow vegetables and fruit at home.	identified as not available in Draft SHELAA.
268	Land south of Half Moon Lane	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in Grundisburgh have been identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
268	Land south of Half Moon Lane	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	
268	Land south of Half Moon Lane	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	I would support development in plots 268	Comment noted. Site identified as not available in Draft SHELAA.
268	Land south of Half Moon Lane	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Register objections in terms of character, outside of village envelope, recent upheld appeal decision, single track road, lack of pavements and any development would result in creep into rural areas and should not be permitted.	
268	Land south of Half Moon Lane	Housing	Grundisburgh	Artisan PPS Ltd	Site promoted by landowner for residential use	
268	Land south of	Housing	Grundisburgh	SCC	Widening of Half Moon	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Half Moon Lane			Highways	Lane required plus footway links to village amenities	
283	Land rear of The Gables, The Green, Grundisburgh, IP13 6TA	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in Grundisburgh have been identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
283	Land rear of The Gables, The Green, Grundisburgh, IP13 6TA	Housing	Grundisburgh	Grundisburgh Parish Council	Not suitable	
283	Land rear of The Gables, The Green, Grundisburgh, IP13 6TA	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Area of woodland close to centre of village in an important wildlife corridor and within the Conservation Area.	Comment noted. The site is not potential due to significant access constraints.
351	Land west of Chapel Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Land promoted for development	Comments noted. Site has been identified as potential. However, site 1119 has been deemed a more suitable site for allocation due to better connectivity with services and facilities in the village.
351	Land west of Chapel Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in
351	Land west of	Housing	Grundisburgh	Grundisburgh	Not suitable	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Chapel Road			h Parish Council		Grundisburgh have been identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
351	Land west of Chapel Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Strutt & Parker	Site promoted by landowner for residential use	Comments noted. Site 1119 has been deemed a more suitable site for allocation due to better connectivity with services and facilities in the village.
351	Land west of Chapel Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Register objections in terms of character, outside of village envelope, recent upheld appeal decision, single track road, lack of pavements and any development would result in creep into rural areas and should not be permitted.	
351	Land west of Chapel Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	SCC Highways	No footways on Park Road or Chapel Road - required	
560	Land to the East of Woodbridge Road	Housing, Open Space	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in Grundisburgh have been identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
560	Land to the East of Woodbridge Road	Housing, Open Space	Grundisburgh	Grundisburgh Parish Council	Not suitable	
643	The Bungalow, Meeting Lane	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	I would support development in plots 643.	Comment noted. Site identified as not

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						available in Draft SHELAA.
643	The Bungalow, Meeting Lane	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in Grundisburgh have been identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
786	Land between the Old Police House and Park View, Park Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in Grundisburgh have been identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
786	Land between the Old Police House and Park View, Park Road	Housing	Grundisburgh	Grundisburgh Parish Council	Not suitable	
1119	Land to the west of Ipswich Road, Grundisburgh	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private individual	Not suitable	Site 1119 is identified as a preferred site. The policy SCLP12.48 requires a mix of housing and for development to be sympathetic to the setting of Grundisburgh Hall Park.
1119	Land to the west of Ipswich Road, Grundisburgh	Housing	Grundisburgh	Grundisburgh Parish Council	Not suitable	
1133	Land to the east	Housing	Grundisburgh	Private	Not suitable	Comments noted. Site

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	of Woodbridge Road, Grundisburgh			individual		1119 is identified as a preferred site. Others in Grundisburgh have been identified as potentially suitable however not preferred for allocation.
1133	Land to the east of Woodbridge Road, Grundisburgh	Housing	Grundisburgh	Grundisburgh Parish Council	Not suitable	
207	Land opposite Hacheston Lodge, The Street	Housing	Hacheston	Hacheston Parish Council	Highways issues, close to Special Landscape Area, possibly of archaeological significance, barn owls are present.	Site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
266	Land in between 12 and 14 Main Road	Housing	Hacheston	Hacheston Parish Council	No objections from residents. Is the site required? Development consistent with current housing format may be appropriate.	Site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
467	Land fronting east side of The Street, Hacheston	Housing	Hacheston	Hacheston Parish Council	High pressure gas pipeline runs through the site. Could be highways issues. Out of character with the village. 5 houses may be acceptable, if developed alongside SSP9.	Comments noted. Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however due to its location in the sensitive river valley landscape other sites in the District

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						were considered preferable for allocation.
467	Land fronting east side of The Street, Hacheston	Housing	Hacheston	Private individual	Essential for the well being of the community and local wildlife that a balance is maintained between open spaces, residential and business development. Object to development on this site due to amount of development in the village, impact on views across river valley and ecological impact on wildlife.	Comments noted. Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft SHELAA however due to its location in the sensitive river valley landscape other sites in the District were considered preferable for allocation.
467	Land fronting east side of The Street, Hacheston	Housing	Hacheston	Private individual	Object to development due to impact on landscape and views, noise and pollution and important to retain green spaces to offer rural feeling.	
467	Land fronting east side of The Street, Hacheston	Housing	Hacheston	East Coast Planning Services Ltd	Site promoted by landowner for residential use	
652	Land opposite 2 Low Meadows, The Street	Housing	Hacheston	Private individual	Object to site being developed due to issues related flooding, traffic, services,	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
652	Land opposite 2	Housing	Hacheston	Hacheston	Issues identified include	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Low Meadows, The Street			Parish Council	related to highways, loss of agricultural land, visibility of site from footpaths and Special Landscape Area, overlooking, development wouldn't be in keeping with ribbon development. Other sites in Hacheston don't have such issues.	however due to access issues other sites in the District are considered to be preferable for allocation.
652	Land opposite 2 Low Meadows, The Street	Housing	Hacheston	Private individual	Site previously rejected due to highways, minimal verge width, overlooking properties and volume of traffic on B1116. Site is currently a productive arable field and development will cause loss of high quality agricultural land.	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft SHELAA however due to access issues other sites in the District are considered to be preferable for allocation.
652	Land opposite 2 Low Meadows, The Street	Housing	Hacheston	Private individual	Site previously rejected due to highways, minimal verge width, overlooking properties and volume of traffic on B1116 and no footpaths. Appreciated that growth is needed and suggest scoring system introduced by Babergh/Mid Suffolk to assess facilities in	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					each village.	
652	Land opposite 2 Low Meadows, The Street	Housing	Hacheston	Private individual	Site is higher than B1116, currently used for farming, land already floods due to heavy rain. Building houses on this site will only increase flooding and previous rejection by Council shows that the site is unsustainable.	
652	Land opposite 2 Low Meadows, The Street	Housing	Hacheston	Private individual	Site is elevated above B1116, increased traffic levels on B1116, no convenience store or bus service in Hacheston and limited employment opportunities in the village.	
652	Land opposite 2 Low Meadows, The Street	Housing	Hacheston	Private individual	Strongly object to the site, land is elevated, adjacent properties already subject to flooding, no facilities in the village.	
652	Land opposite 2 Low Meadows, The Street	Housing	Hacheston	East Coast Planning Services Ltd	Site promoted by landowner for residential use	
652	Land opposite 2 Low Meadows, The Street	Housing	Hacheston	Private individual	Strongly object to this site because of traffic issues in the village, loss of productive farmland,	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					outside of the physical limits boundary within the Special Landscape Area.	
652	Land opposite 2 Low Meadows, The Street	Housing	Hacheston	Private individual	Object to any development in this location, loss of green space and views across the river valley, as well as ecological impact of such development.	
646	Land South of Grundisburgh Road, Hasketon	Housing	Hasketon	Private individual	Any further development on outskirts of Woodbridge would adversely affect those currently living in Woodbridge and tourists visiting the area.	Comments noted. The site is identified as not a potential site in the Draft SHELAA as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of a settlement.
646	Land South of Grundisburgh Road, Hasketon	Housing	Hasketon	Woodbridge Town Council	Proposal is inappropriate development.	
646	Land South of Grundisburgh Road, Hasketon	Housing	Hasketon	Woodbridge Society	Should not be developing west of the A12.	
646	Land South of Grundisburgh Road, Hasketon	Housing	Hasketon	SCC Highways	Site is remote from Hasketon and Woodbridge. Significant investment required to provide sustainable links to amenities.	
35	Land adj. to Beechview,	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish	Site is outside of the physical limits boundary,	Comments, particularly in relation to access,

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Rectory Road			Council	within the AONB where livestock farming is undertaken, flooding, encroachment of biodiversity and geodiversity, narrow access.	reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan. Comments noted.
35	Land adj. to Beechview, Rectory Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Loss of green space, crowding.	
35	Land adj. to Beechview, Rectory Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Rejected previously because of access.	
35	Land adj. to Beechview, Rectory Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
35	Land adj. to Beechview, Rectory Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Any development of more than 10 dwellings in the AONB would need to be justified as being of "national interest".	
69	Land adjacent to 8 Carlton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	This land already has planning permission for one house, which is in the process of being built, therefore this plot should be removed from the plan	Comments noted. Site removed from assessment as now has permission.
69	Land adjacent to 8 Carlton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is not suitable for development due to access	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					and sightline.	
69	Land adjacent to 8 Carlton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is agricultural land and green field site. Would be environmental vandalism to even think about developing it.	
69	Land adjacent to 8 Carlton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Not fit for any purpose, no bus service, sewage system is not coping, water pressure is inadequate, flooding is disruptive and dangerous to existing community.	
69	Land adjacent to 8 Carlton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
96	Land adjacent to 8 Carlton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access, inappropriate location for business.	
264	Land at Lyndhurst, Rectory Road	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity, area of historic importance.	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
264	Land at Lyndhurst, Rectory Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Loss of green space, crowding.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
264	Land at Lyndhurst, Rectory Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
264	Land at Lyndhurst, Rectory Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Rejected previously because of access.	
272	Land surrounding Meadow Park Livery, Alderton Road	Affordable Housing, Employment, Tourism	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Site is outside of the physical limits boundary, within the AONB where livestock farming is undertaken, flooding, encroachment of biodiversity and geodiversity, narrow access.	Comments noted. Site removed from assessment as now has permission.
272	Land surrounding Meadow Park Livery, Alderton Road	Affordable Housing, Employment, Tourism	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is not suitable for development due to access and sightline.	
272	Land surrounding Meadow Park Livery, Alderton Road	Affordable Housing, Employment, Tourism	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
272	Land surrounding Meadow Park Livery, Alderton	Affordable Housing, Employment, Tourism	Hollesley	Private individual	Not fit for any purpose, no bus service, sewage system is not coping, water pressure is inadequate,	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road				flooding is disruptive and dangerous to existing community.	
272	Land surrounding Meadow Park Livery, Alderton Road	Affordable Housing, Employment, Tourism	Hollesley	Private individual	Proposal should be dismissed.	
323	Land west of Manor Farm	Camp site	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Site is outside of the physical limits boundary, access is via a single unmade track, prime agricultural land and one of a few areas where people can experience wilderness.	Comments noted. The site is not a potential site in the Draft SHELAA as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of the settlement.
323	Land west of Manor Farm	Camp site	Hollesley	RSPB	We raise particular concerns about the proposed allocation of a camp site at site 323, given that this is directly bordered on three sides by the Sandlings SPA.	
323	Land west of Manor Farm	Camp site	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
398	land at Meadow Farm, Meadow Farm Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Site is outside of the physical limits boundary, regularly floods and site is	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable through the

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					only accessed via a track which is unsuitable for emergency vehicles.	SHELAA methodology, these issues have been considered through the SHELAAA. Site not proposed for allocation due to access issues in particular.
398	land at Meadow Farm, Meadow Farm Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
398	land at Meadow Farm, Meadow Farm Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is not suitable for development due to access and sightline.	
398	land at Meadow Farm, Meadow Farm Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is agricultural land and green field site. Would be environmental vandalism to even think about developing it.	
398	land at Meadow Farm, Meadow Farm Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site not suitable as the land is liable to subsidence and becoming blocked, single track unsuitable for traffic, adjacent to Local Nature Reserve, part of the heritage of the village.	
398	land at Meadow Farm, Meadow Farm Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Village suffers from both tidal and surface rainwater flooding. Sites which are impacted or cause more severe flooding should be avoided.	
398	land at Meadow	Housing	Hollesley	Private	Site rejected because of	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Farm, Meadow Farm Lane			individual	flood zone.	
398	land at Meadow Farm, Meadow Farm Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Would encroach on area which has always been a haven for wildlife. Traffic from these sites would require development of the track to Meadow Farm.	
398	land at Meadow Farm, Meadow Farm Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access, inappropriate location for business.	
443	Land east of Fourways, Alderton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Landowner / agent	Land promoted for development	Comments noted however in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment the site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
443	land east of Fourways, Alderton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Site is outside of the physical limits boundary, not accessible via road and access is dangerous, area of wildlife habitats and poorly integrated with the main village.	Comments noted. The site been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related
443	land east of	Housing	Hollesley	Private	Do not support this site for	adjoining or well related

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Fourways, Alderton Road			individual	development and support the Parish Council submission.	to the form of the settlement.
443	land east of Fourways, Alderton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	No access, an untrodden nature reserve and already recently rejected.	
443	land east of Fourways, Alderton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	believe this site would be totally unsuitable for development as the access to it is via a narrow single lane dirt track which is not suitable for large vehicles and could not cope with the addition of more vehicles as it already gets	
443	land east of Fourways, Alderton Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Plot was purchased as an investment. It has not been used in any significant way by the owner who does not live in the village. The access to the highway is a narrow unmade track and the exit is obscured by land belonging to others and is hazardous as a consequence. It is unsuitable for development.	
466	The Orchard,	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley	Site is outside of the	Comments noted. The

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	School lane Hollesey. (off Hollesey school drive)			Parish Council	physical limits boundary, trees and hedges on the site may be of biodiversity value, site is accessible via a single track which may not be suitable to accommodate development.	site is not a potential site due to significant access constraints.
466	The Orchard, School lane Hollesey. (off Hollesey school drive)	Housing	Hollesey	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
466	The Orchard, School lane Hollesey. (off Hollesey school drive)	Housing	Hollesey	Private individual	Access, sightline, oversized development, and already recently refused.	
466	The Orchard, School lane Hollesey. (off Hollesey school drive)	Housing	Hollesey	Private individual	Site could be considered for a small hub for high-tech businesses.	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesey	Hollesey Parish Council	Site is outside of the physical limits boundary, partially within flood zone, accessible via a single track road and borders an area where a rare moth nesting	Comments reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for development in the local plan.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					has been recorded.	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access, sightline, oversized development	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Unacceptable, would be a large development on greenfield site.	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is agricultural land and green field site. Would be environmental vandalism to even think about developing it.	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Plan for proposed development is not in any way fit for purpose.	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road,	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Development of this site would destroy a large area of beauty outside of village	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	IP12 3RQ				boundary. Rejected previously because it is poorly related to existing settlement. Access crosses a flood zone and can be cut off in tidal flooding.	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Register strong objections to this site, area not suitable for large volumes of traffic, village is prone to power cuts.	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Development of this site would destroy a large area of beauty outside of village boundary. Rejected previously because it is poorly related to existing settlement. Access crosses a flood zone and can be cut off in tidal flooding.	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Development would completely destroy a large area of natural beauty and wildlife habitat outside of the village boundary.	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road,	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	All sites would encroach on an area that is a haven for wildlife.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	IP12 3RQ					
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Highly restricted access and cause mass environmental destruction	
477	Meadow Park Livery Stables, Alderton Road, IP12 3RQ	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access, Inappropriate location for business.	
532	Land fronting Rectory road, Hollesley	Housing, open spaces	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Site outside of physical limits boundary, small portion of the site is at risk from flooding, trees and hedges have great biodiversity value, site would bring unwanted street lights and noise to a quiet area of the village.	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potential site in the SHELAA it is not proposed for allocation in particular due to landscape impact.
532	Land fronting Rectory road, Hollesley	Housing, open spaces	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
532	Land fronting Rectory road, Hollesley	Housing, open spaces	Hollesley	Private individual	Oversized development.	
532	Land fronting Rectory road, Hollesley	Housing, open spaces	Hollesley	Private individual	Particularly unacceptable, in our view, would be large developments on greenfield sites in the surrounding	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					agricultural land	
532	Land fronting Rectory road, Hollesley	Housing, open spaces	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is agricultural land and green field site. Would be environmental vandalism to even think about developing it.	
532	Land fronting Rectory road, Hollesley	Housing, open spaces	Hollesley	Private individual	Could be considered is the number of houses was 20, but with sound ecological sustainable design.	
532	Land fronting Rectory road, Hollesley	Housing, open spaces	Hollesley	SCC Highways	Footway extension on Rectory road required	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Site outside of the physical limits boundary, large portion of the site at risk of flooding, wildlife corridor, and access of a tight and awkward junction.	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potential site in the SHELAA it is not proposed for allocation in particular due to landscape impact.
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access, overcrowding.	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is agricultural land and green field site. Would be environmental vandalism to even think about	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					developing it.	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is unsuitable because of a high risk of surface water flooding.	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Rejected previously because of access.	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Register strong objections to this site, area not suitable for large volumes of traffic, village is prone to power cuts	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site not compatible with AONB, provides valuable wildlife corridor, high risk of surface water flooding and access is already congested, narrow and problematic.	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is a risk of surface water flooding, high wildlife value and access is not wide enough for two cars to pass.	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access to this site would probably be onto Tower Hill which would require a junction having very limited visibility.	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site prone to flooding, full of beautiful trees, teeming	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					with wildlife and prone to flooding.	
542	Tower House, Tower Hill Road	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Area prone to flooding, full of fantastic trees and teeming with wildlife. Site access is restricted and would require mass destruction of superb environment.	
563	Land opposite Moorlands, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Outside of the physical limits boundary, vulnerable to flooding, close to special protection area, haven for wildlife.	Comments noted. The site's proximity to a Special Protection Area for Wild Birds is particularly significant to the site not being proposed for allocation for development.
563	Land opposite Moorlands, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
563	Land opposite Moorlands, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	If the day comes that the village needs more homes, these sites could be looked at in detail, but only for starter / downsizer housing to retrieve the village balance.	
563	Land opposite Moorlands, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is agricultural land and green field site. Would be environmental vandalism to even think about	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					developing it.	
563	Land opposite Moorlands, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Large developments on greenfield sites in the surrounding agricultural land would be unacceptable.	
563	Land opposite Moorlands, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Would be possible if the (fewer) housing was affordable, ecologically designed and carefully sited back from the road;	
563	Land opposite Moorlands, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	AONB views any development of more than 10 housing in this area would need to be justified as being of national interest.	
563	Land opposite Moorlands, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access to the site would either be at a dangerous corner with very limited visibility.	
563	Land opposite Moorlands, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site could be considered for a small hub for high-tech businesses.	
567	Land East of Rectory Road, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Outside of the physical limits boundary, site is currently used for farmland, parts of the site at risk from flooding, trees and hedges	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as a potential site in the SHELAA it is not proposed for allocation

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					in the area are of biodiversity value.	in particular due to landscape impact.
567	Land East of Rectory Road, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
567	Land East of Rectory Road, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	If the day comes that the village needs more homes, these sites could be looked at in detail, but only for starter / downsizer housing to retrieve the village balance.	
567	Land East of Rectory Road, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is agricultural land and green field site. Would be environmental vandalism to even think about developing it.	
567	Land East of Rectory Road, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Large developments on greenfield sites in the surrounding agricultural land would be unacceptable.	
567	Land East of Rectory Road, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	In the much longer term, sites that could be considered are 567 if designated as an exception site with fewer houses;	
761	Land to the West	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley	Outside of the physical	Comments noted. Whilst

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	of Duck Corner			Parish Council	limits boundary, in agricultural use, part of the site at risk from flooding and would change the character of the village.	the site is identified as a potential site in the SHELAA it is not proposed for allocation in particular due to landscape impact.
761	Land to the West of Duck Corner	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
761	Land to the West of Duck Corner	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Ribbon development destroying the village's character	
761	Land to the West of Duck Corner	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Ribbon development such as site 761 is also unacceptable , creating a precedent for future sprawl.	
761	Land to the West of Duck Corner	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	AONB views any development of more than 10 housing in this area would need to be justified as being of national interest.	
917	Cliff Cottage, Fox Hill and Highfield, Fox Hill	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Site is located close to known habitats of protected species, close to a Grade II Listed building.	The site is identified in the Draft SHELAA as not being made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
917	Cliff Cottage, Fox Hill and	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Highfield, Fox Hill				the Parish Council submission.	
917	Cliff Cottage, Fox Hill and Highfield, Fox Hill	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Overcrowding, Access, Inappropriate location for business	
917	Cliff Cottage, Fox Hill and Highfield, Fox Hill	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access is very small and difficult to enter is another car is waiting to exit. More housing means there will be more children crossing the road.	
917	Cliff Cottage, Fox Hill and Highfield, Fox Hill	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Roads on the peninsula are not adequate, no bus service, sewerage system is not coping, water pressure is poor, important routes get flooded and any more development will destroy the community.	
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Site is outside of the physical limits boundary, site located close to known habitats of protected species, access is via a single track and close to private nature reserve.	
939	Orchard Cottage,	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Stebbings Lane				the Parish Council submission.	
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Overcrowding, Access.	
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is agricultural land and green field site. Would be environmental vandalism to even think about developing it.	
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site would be reached by a poorly surfaced track, not wide enough for two cars. A high density development would be out of keeping with the character of the village and the AONB.	
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Register strong objections to this site, area not suitable for large volumes of traffic, village is prone to power cuts	
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site would be reached by a poorly surfaced track, not wide enough for two cars. A high density development would be out of keeping with the character of the village and the AONB.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	High-density development of this site would have a detrimental effect on this AONB in terms of scenic beauty and wildlife habitat and to the enjoyment of the view by passing users of the adjacent bridleway.	
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	High-density development of this site would have a detrimental effect on this AONB in terms of scenic beauty and wildlife habitat and to the enjoyment of the view by passing users of the adjacent bridleway.	
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access to this site could only be via Stebbings Lane which at this point is no more than a single lane track, often used by pedestrians and quite unsuited to additional traffic.	
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site 939 at Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane would cause massive access issues as it is situated off a narrow privately owned	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					track and would involve also destruction of wildlife and trees on a huge scale.	
939	Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site 939 at Orchard Cottage, Stebbings Lane would cause massive access issues as it is situated off a narrow privately owned track and would involve also destruction of wildlife and trees on a huge scale.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Site outside of the physical limits boundary, part at risk from flooding, site is useful as an area of open space, not easily accessible, site adjacent to woodland which is a habitat for varied wildlife.	Draft SHELAA identifies the site as not being available.
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Do not support this site for development and support the Parish Council submission.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Far too large for the village to cope with under any foreseeable circumstance.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is agricultural land and green field site. Would be environmental vandalism to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					even think about developing it.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	A site of this magnitude could not be considered to be compatible with the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and the National Planning Policy Framework. Site is not easily accessed and roads would need significant development.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Register strong objections to this site, area not suitable for large volumes of traffic, village is prone to power cuts	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is unsuitable for development now or in the near future.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is in continual agricultural use, clearly visible within the AONB and would need significant road widening.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is in continual agricultural use, clearly visible within the AONB and would need significant road widening.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is prime farmland and adjacent to woodland. Development would be overwhelming for the village.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Any further development to be restricted to small, sensitive infill sites close to the village centre.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access is narrow and a dangerous pinch point on the main road. Additional units would stretch some local resources.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	As the UK exits Europe, it should be striving to increase its own production of food not seeking to concrete over fecund arable land.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Prime agricultural land and access is a narrow country footpath.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Prime agricultural land and access is a narrow country footpath.	
1025	Land north of Stebbing's Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	SCC Highways	Bushey Lane unlikely to be able to accommodate traffic flows of	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					development without significant improvement	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Hollesley Parish Council	Site outside of the physical limits boundary, partially in flood zone 2, potential for archaeological finds, site is accessed via a narrow road, prime agricultural land which should remain.	Draft SHELAA identifies the site as not being available.
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Already partially built on and many problems caused. The lane has no passing places or possibility of them, hence access cannot be achieved.	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Site is agricultural land and green field site. Would be environmental vandalism to even think about developing it.	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Village suffers from both tidal and surface water flooding and more development would cause more severe flooding.	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB views any development of more than 10 dwellings in this area to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					be detrimental to our AONB and would need to be justified as being of 'national interest'	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	To allow further building in or around the village, unless this is restricted to small, sensitive infill sites close to the village centre, would, we believe, have a detrimental effect on the village - increasing traffic on the main street	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Access is along an narrow lane which has no possibility of being widened.	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Black Ditch Meadows CWS. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Portion of this plot is farmland, hazardous road junctions.	
1026	Land north of	Housing	Hollesley	Private	Roads on the peninsula are	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Bushey Lane, Hollesley			individual	not adequate, no bus service, sewerage system is not coping, water pressure is poor, important routes get flooded and any more development will destroy the community.	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Formally register objections to the site because of highway access, geography and wildlife,.	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	Private individual	Register strong objection because lane is narrow with infrequent passing places, regularly floods and infrastructure is not capable of supporting further development.	
1026	Land north of Bushey Lane, Hollesley	Housing	Hollesley	SCC Highways	Tower Hill and Stebbings Lane unlikely to be able to accommodate traffic flows of development without significant improvement	
65	Land north of White Gables, Main Road	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	It should be noted that the land is low lying and attention would have to be given to the possibility of flooding, especially as the existing fields currently	Comments noted. The site is only considered to be well related to the form of the settlement only if considered with site 239, however 239

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					absorb excess rainfall.	not available.
120	Main Road	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Although somewhat isolated, the land does have the advantage of being directly on the A12, making access easier. We would prefer there to be no further holiday homes in the area as there are already several large caravan/lodge parks.	The site been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
239	Land north of Belvedere Close	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	It should be noted that the land is low lying and attention would have to be given to the possibility of flooding, especially as the existing fields currently absorb excess rainfall.	Comments noted. The Draft SHELAA identifies the site as not being available.
287	Land east of Benstead, Main Road	Housing or Holiday lets	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Although somewhat isolated, the land does have the advantage of being directly on the A12, making access easier. We would prefer there to be no further holiday homes in the area as there are already several large caravan/lodge parks.	Comments noted however the site been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
326	Land south of Bankside, Dorleys Corner	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Access would be on to an exceedingly narrow lane	Comments noted however the site been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
363	Land north of Park Farm House	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	It seems that these plots would access onto Rosemary Lane, which is another narrow, winding lane and to support the numbers of extra inhabitants huge amounts of further facilities would be required	Comments noted. The Draft SHELAA identifies the site as not being available.
450	Land Adj. Mill Farm, Rosemary Lane IP17 2QS	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	It seems that these plots would access onto Rosemary Lane, which is another narrow, winding lane and to support the numbers of extra inhabitants huge amounts of further facilities would be required	Comments noted. The site is identified as a potential site. However, the Council supports the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for delivering further development to the existing Local Plan

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
450	Land Adj. Mill Farm, Rosemary Lane IP17 2QS	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	SCC Highways	Provision of footway along Carlton road. Potential A12 junction safety improvement required in conjunction with other sites	allocation SCLP12.49.
458	Land South & East Cherry Tree Cottage, Curlew Green	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Concerned about development on this site due to proximity of listed building, ecological value of site, stretched facilities in Saxmundham, volume of traffic.	Comments noted. The site is identified as not potential as it is not within, adjacent, adjoining or well related to a settlement and therefore, has not been considered for allocation.
458	Land South & East Cherry Tree Cottage, Curlew Green	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	If this site were developed, it would seem likely that many more than the proposed eight dwellings would be imposed.	
458	Land South & East Cherry Tree Cottage, Curlew Green	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Development on this site would be devastating for the area, destroying wildlife and ancient woodlands.	
487	Land adjacent to FirTrees, Rosemary Lane	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	It seems that these plots would access onto Rosemary Lane, which is another narrow, winding lane and to support the numbers of extra inhabitants huge amounts of further facilities would	Comment noted. The site has been identified as a potential site albeit that access issues would need to be resolved. The Council supports the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					be required	delivering further development to the existing Local Plan allocation SCLP12.49.
570	Land at Main Road, Kelsale	Housing/community use	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Development would destroy wildlife habitats, road access would be dangerous and drainage of rainwater.	Comments noted. The site has been identified as not potential as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to a settlement.
570	Land at Main Road, Kelsale	Housing/community use	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Any building on this plot would suffer from access problems as the site is on a hill. Any commercial/recreational/public building would need to have more than adequate parking facilities.	
570	Land at Main Road, Kelsale	Housing/community use	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Development on this site would be devastating for the area, destroying wildlife and ancient woodlands.	
570	Land at Main Road, Kelsale	Housing/community use	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Site not suitable for development, raised piece of land, no mains drainage.	
570	Land at Main Road, Kelsale	Housing/community use	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Site not suitable due to raised land, narrow lanes to access the site, ambiguity over mixed use is a concern. Any buildings	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					could leave to overlooking of existing properties.	
570	Land at Main Road, Kelsale	Housing/community use	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private individual	Mixed use is too vague – more detail is needed. Concern about access to the site and noise from increased vehicle activity.	
1020	Land adjacent to Pear Tree Close, Kelsale cum Carlton	Housing	Kelsale cum Carlton	SCC Highways	Link to footway along Carlton road. Potential A12 junction safety improvement required in conjunction with other sites	Comment noted. Site identified as a potential site. However, coalescence of Kelsale and Carlton has been identified as an issue. The Council supports the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for delivering further development to the existing Local Plan allocation SCLP12.49.
64	Bracken Hall, Main Road	Housing	Kesgrave	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site identified as unavailable in SHELAA
64	Bracken Hall, Main Road	Housing	Kesgrave	Private individual	Greenfield Land – Not Sustainable Locations	Comment noted. The site is not a potential site due to significant landscape constraints and availability.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
174	land off Main Road, opposite Bracken Avenue	Housing	Kesgrave	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site not identified as potential site in SHELAA due to issues relating to TPOs covering much of the site plus issues related to impact on protected species and SSSI.
174	land off Main Road, opposite Bracken Avenue	Housing	Kesgrave	Private individual	Greenfield Land – Not Sustainable Locations	Comment noted. The site is not a potential site due to significant biodiversity constraints as noted in the comments.
174	land off Main Road, opposite Bracken Avenue	Housing	Kesgrave	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is within Kesgrave Wood and Sinks Valley CWS and development would therefore result in a loss of CWS	
174	land off Main Road, opposite Bracken Avenue	Housing	Kesgrave	SCC Highways	Footway widening required	
339	Land at and surrounding 306 Main Road	Housing	Kesgrave	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site identified as not potential in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment due to resulting in the loss of County Wildlife Site.
339	Land at and surrounding 306 Main Road	Housing	Kesgrave	Land owner / agent	Land promoted for development	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
339	Land at and surrounding 306 Main Road	Housing	Kesgrave	Private individual	Greenfield Land – Not Sustainable Locations	The site is identified as not potential in the Draft SHELAA due to resulting in loss of a County Wildlife Site.
339	Land at and surrounding 306 Main Road	Housing	Kesgrave	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is within Kesgrave Wood and Sinks Valley CWS and development would therefore result in a loss of CWS	
520	Land East of Bell Lane & South of Kesgrave	Mixed use	Kesgrave	Historic England	Scheduled monuments to the east of the site, consideration needs to be given to their setting.	Comments noted however the site is not proposed for allocation through the Local Plan as the strategy does not focus growth on the east edge of Ipswich.
520	Land East of Bell Lane & South of Kesgrave	Mixed use	Kesgrave	Historic England	Exclude this site from development	Comments noted however the site is not proposed for allocation through the Local Plan as the strategy does not focus growth on the east edge of Ipswich.
520	Land East of Bell Lane & South of Kesgrave	Mixed use	Kesgrave	Historic England	Land promoted for development.	The site is identified as potentially suitable in the SHELAA. However development of this scale would be contrary to the strategy for the Local Plan which seeks

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						to focus strategic scale development in Felixstowe and Saxmundham alongside provision of infrastructure. Alternative strategies are considered in Appendix A Alternative Policies of the First Draft Local Plan.
520	Land East of Bell Lane & South of Kesgrave	Mixed use	Kesgrave	Historic England	In strategically important Foxhall Rd corridor. Essential to create wide and effective public and wildlife corridor and maintain open character. Old radio masts should be retained.	Comments noted however the site is not proposed for allocation through the Local Plan as the strategy does not focus growth on the east edge of Ipswich.
520	Land East of Bell Lane & South of Kesgrave	Mixed use	Kesgrave	Private individual	Greenfield Land – Not Sustainable Location. Recent appeal on this land was defeated mainly on the grounds that the location was not sustainable. Identified issues in the Sustainability Appraisal.	The site is identified as potentially suitable in the SHELAA. However development of this scale would be contrary to the strategy for the Local Plan which seeks to focus strategic scale development in
520	Land East of Bell Lane & South of Kesgrave	Mixed use	Kesgrave	Rushmere St Andrew Parish	Recently been rejected on appeal. Sustainability of traffic along Foxhall Road,	Felixstowe and Saxmundham alongside

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
				Council	feeder into Ipswich	provision of infrastructure. Alternative strategies are considered in Appendix A Alternative Policies of the First Draft Local Plan. Highways comments are considered through the draft SHELAA.
520	Land East of Bell Lane & South of Kesgrave	Mixed use	Kesgrave	SCC Highways	Larger scheme would require alternative highway mitigation at Foxhall Road. Need for sustainable links to Longstrops and Kesgrave as well as footway/cycle links.	
618	Area FF and Fentons Wood, Wilkinson Drive	Housing	Kesgrave	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Comments noted. Site below the 0.2ha site size threshold
618	Area FF and Fentons Wood, Wilkinson Drive	Housing	Kesgrave	Greenways Project	Valuable woodland with high community value.	
618	Area FF and Fentons Wood, Wilkinson Drive	Housing	Kesgrave	Private individual	This site is one of the last remaining woodlands in Kesgrave itself. It is a valued community asset and rich in wildlife. It is therefore entirely unsuitable for development	Comments noted. The site is not a potential site due to loss of open space.
618	Area FF and Fentons Wood, Wilkinson Drive	Housing	Kesgrave	SCC Highways	No Comments - extension to existing development area.	
725	Land to the north of the Tesco Store,	Housing	Kesgrave	Private individual	Do not believe this land was ever intended for residential use but for	Comment noted. The site has been identified as not potential as it is

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Ropes Drive, Kesgrave, IP5 2FU				business/retail use.	below the size threshold for allocation within the First Draft Local Plan.
726	Land to the south of the Tesco Store, Ropes Drive, Kesgrave, IP5 2FU	Housing	Kesgrave	Private individual	Do not believe this land was ever intended for residential use but for business/retail use.	Comment noted. The site has been identified as not potential as it is below the size threshold for allocation within the First Draft Local Plan.
870	Land at Kiln Farm, Main Road	Housing	Kesgrave	Historic England	Site contains three scheduled monuments – their setting should form part of considerations for this site.	Comments noted however site is not available for consideration in the Local Plan.
870	Land at Kiln Farm, Main Road	Housing	Kesgrave	Greenways Project	Significant areas of semi natural habitats. Part of area should form strategic green space to mitigate development of the scale proposed in the Local Plan.	The Local Plan does not seek to allocate significant growth in the area to the east of Ipswich and therefore it is not necessary to consider mitigation of this scale in this area.
74	Land adj to Moses Cottage and north of Lings Field	Housing	Kettleburgh	Kettleburgh Parish Council	Not appropriate for development	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – However, it is deemed that Site 544 (draft site

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						allocation: SCLP12.50) is a more suitable site due to being more centrally located in the village, and the scale of development if both sites were to be allocated would be inappropriate relative to the size of the settlement.
198	Land adj. Churchside, Church Road	Affordable Housing	Kettleburgh	Kettleburgh Parish Council	Not appropriate for development	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – However, it was deemed Site 544 is a more suitable site due to being more centrally located within the village.
198	Land adj. Churchside, Church Road	Affordable Housing	Kettleburgh	Private individual	Site in inappropriate because of impact on village character and amenity, traffic considerations, environmental impact and lack of housing need in the	Comment noted. Issues related to access and impact on heritage are considered through the Draft SHELAA. The site is not a preferred site as site 544 elsewhere in

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					village.	the Parish is more suitable for allocation due to being more centrally located.
245	Land west of Rectory Road	Affordable Housing	Kettleburgh	Kettleburgh Parish Council	Not appropriate for development	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – However, it was deemed Site 544 is a more suitable site due to being more centrally located within the village.
538	Rectory Farm, Kettleburgh	Housing	Kettleburgh	Kettleburgh Parish Council	Not appropriate for development	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
544	Land and Buildings Northside of the Street	Housing	Kettleburgh	Kettleburgh Parish Council	Not appropriate for development	Site identified as a preferred site in the First Draft Local Plan (site allocation: SCLP12.50). Development of the site

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						accords with the Local Plan Strategy of delivering moderate growth in the rural areas of the district.
225	Little Acre, Church Lane	Housing	Kirton	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	STRONGLY NEGATIVE. Access to the site via Church Lane is so narrow that a car cannot pass a pedestrian and if two cars meet, one must back up all the way to the exit of the road.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA
225	Little Acre, Church Lane	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Understand it has been turned down in the past due to narrow access.	
225	Little Acre, Church Lane	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Object on grounds of poor access.	
225	Little Acre, Church Lane	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Object on grounds of poor access.	
225	Little Acre, Church Lane	Housing	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for transport, schools and health.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and therefore Sustainability Appraisal not undertaken.
327	Land north of	Housing with Employment	Kirton	Private	Completely unsuitable,	Site identified as

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	A14, East of Walk Farm			individual	would lead to creation of a developed corridor linking towns of Ipswich and Felixstowe.	unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, however part is now covered by site 706 which is proposed for allocation for employment under Policy SCLP12.30 which requires significant landscaping and buffers. The Habitats Regulations Assessment screening identifies the need for appropriate assessment.
327	Land north of A14, East of Walk Farm	Housing with Employment	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for transport, schools and health.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and therefore Sustainability Appraisal not undertaken.
327	Land north of A14, East of Walk Farm	Housing with Employment	Kirton	Private Individual	Development would result in loss of farmland and creation of an industrial	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					belt between Ipswich and Felixstowe	Economic Land Availability Assessment, however part is now covered by site 706 which is proposed for allocation for employment under Policy SCLP12.30 which requires significant landscaping and buffers.
327	Land north of A14, east of Walk Farm	Housing with Employment	Kirton	Private individual	Would be irresponsible and controversial for the Council to allow such development because of loss of good fertile land, development would have a devastating affect on local community, would not provide employment, increased air pollution due to prevailing winds, remove the break between the villages.	Whole site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA, however part is now covered by site 706 which is proposed for allocation for employment under Policy SCLP12.30 which requires signifant landscaping and buffers. The Habitats Regulations Assessment screening identifies the need for appropriate assessment.
327	Land north of A14, east of Walk Farm	Housing with Employment	Kirton	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
327	Land north of A14, east of Walk Farm	Housing with Employment	Kirton	Private individual	Development on this site will result on continuous development between Felixstowe and Ipswich – totally out of keeping with the Suffolk Coastal area. Extra traffic generated would put strain on overloaded road system. Loss of agricultural land and effects on the environment.	
327	Land north of A14, east of Walk Farm	Housing with Employment	Kirton	Private individual	Development of this site for port related activities would have a significant negative impact on local residents through light pollution and 24 hour operation.	
327	Land north of A14, east of Walk Farm	Housing with Employment	Kirton	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	Negative, site isolated from the village, lack of viable access for employment.	
327	Land north of A14, east of	Housing with Employment	Kirton	Private individual	Why do we need to destroy farmland for employment?	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Walk Farm				I am sure that not all industrial sites in Felixstowe, Ipswich and surrounding area are full?	
327	Land north of A14, east of Walk Farm	Housing with Employment	Kirton	SCC Highways	Inappropriate for mixed use due to unsustainable location.	
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should identify negative effects for quality of life, health and housing.	Sustainability Appraisal identifies negative effects on health, air, climate change, biodiversity and landscape. Note that site not preferred for allocation.
362	Land at Innocence Cottage, Innocence Lane	Housing	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for transport, schools and health.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and therefore Sustainability Appraisal not undertaken.
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Hopkins Homes	Land promoted for development.	The site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						has not been proposed for allocation with potential impact on the river valley landscape being an issue.
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for landscape, transport and schools.	Sustainability Appraisal addresses these issues.
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Proposal to create large industrial zones close to quiet village is unbelievable, every effort should be made to utilise brown field sites first. Roads were not designed to accommodate large vehicles and port is likely to be fully automated by 2036. Urban sprawl into the countryside is nibbling away at precious farm land and sewage systems are extremely poor.	Site proposed for housing, not employment uses, however access and highways are identified as issues. Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft SHELAA – However, it is deemed Site 1077 (site allocation: SCLP12.51) is a more suitable site being more centrally located in the village.
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	STRONGLY NEGATIVE. Ribbon development which would significantly link Kirton & Falkenham, adversely affecting their	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					different characters.	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Roads would not be able to support additional properties and volume of extra cars. Concern about school places. Maybe a small development of no more than 10 houses would make more sense.	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Landbridge	Site promoted by landowner for residential use	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Strongly object to this development as it will ruin the character of the village, adverse effect on residential community, increase of noise and light pollution, visual impact of development on wildlife and landscape	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Strongly object as development would encourage urbanisation in the countryside.	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Objection on grounds of access, overlooking of the site, loss of wildlife habitat, highways and drainage	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					infrastructure.	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Strongly object, adverse effect on neighbouring houses, extra noise, traffic and light pollution.	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Objection on grounds of access, overlooking of the site, loss of wildlife habitat, highways and drainage infrastructure.	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site does not give easy access to main road system and would impact impact in a small village.	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Objection on grounds of access, overlooking of the site, loss of wildlife habitat, highways and drainage infrastructure.	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Proposal is unbelievable, brownfield sites should be brought forward first. Existence of safe urban living is being severely jeopardised by HGV on roads never designed to accommodate these vehicles in the first place. Do not buy into the fact	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					that housing is required to meet future employment demand, as the Port if looking to automation, so where will the work come from? Roads associated dangers, with poor junctions and visibility restrictions.	
552	Land fronting Falkenham Road	Housing	Kirton	SCC Highways	Footway extension on Falkenham Road required.	
553	Land fronting Church Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for transport, schools and health.	Sustainability Appraisal addresses these issues.
553	Land fronting Church Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	STRONGLY NEGATIVE. Access to the site via Church Lane is so narrow that a car cannot pass a pedestrian and if two cars meet, one must back up all the way to the exit of the road.	Small village in the strategy for limited housing growth. River valley landscape constraints reflected in the emerging approach to not prefer this site.
553	Land fronting Church Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site been turned down in the past due to narrow access.	
553	Land fronting Church Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Object on grounds of poor access, highways, drainage and impact on character of	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					the rural area.	
553	Land fronting Church Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Object on grounds of poor access, no street lights or pavements.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Hopkins Homes	Development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the village and landscape. Possible drainage issues on the site.	Comments noted however site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for landscape, transport and schools.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and therefore Sustainability Appraisal not undertaken.
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	STRONGLY NEGATIVE. Site lies within an SLA and is a key visual amenity.	Comments noted however site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site has major significance either as flood plain, AONB, meadow lands.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Object on grounds of access, over development,	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Bucklesham Road				loss of wildlife, inadequate highways and drainage.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Access is dangerous, large vehicles using narrow lanes, greenfield site, impact on listed building and wildlife.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site is outside of the physical limits boundary of Kirton. Infrastructure concerns, dangerous roads and bends and site lies within Special Landscape Area.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Development would have a significant environmental impact on the village with detrimental impact on light, traffic and noise pollution and impact on local roads due to increased population.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site previously rejected due to bends in the roads.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Development would totally swamp the village and should be considered off limits.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Object on grounds of access, traffic, overdevelopment and loss of wildlife.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site rejected on previous occasions, Kirton is a village with narrow roads and could not cope with influx of vehicles. Green field site which would lead to decimation of a beautiful village.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Majority of vehicles travel faster than speed restrictions despite severe bends. Kirton has no school and minimal employment; site is within special landscape area, eradication of habitat.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site rejected previously, on a dangerous bend with no safe access point and drainage issues.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site is on a dangerous bend with no pavements or street lights. Drainage issues in the area.	
654	Land to the rear	Housing	Kirton	Private	Site unsuitable for housing,	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	of 101-137 Bucklesham Road			individual	on a dangerous bend with no pavements and drainage issues.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site rejected previously, impact on listed building and poor road and access arrangements. Kirton is a beautiful village	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	Parish Council oppose use of land which would contribute to the urbanisation of green space between Ipswich and Felixstowe.	
654	Land to the rear of 101-137 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	SCC Highways	Footway along site frontage on Bucklesham road required.	
754	Land West of Bucklesham Road	Housing and open space	Kirton	Trinity College, Cambridge	Land promoted for development	Site identified as a potentially suitable site in the SHELAA although it is considered that site 1077 is more suitable for allocation as it would enable gaps in the built area to be retained.
754	Land West of Bucklesham Road	Housing and open space	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for landscape,	Addressed in Sustainability Appraisal. However site not

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
				Council	transport and schools.	selected as preferred for allocation.
754	Land West of Bucklesham Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	STRONGLY NEGATIVE. Key visual amenity for an SLA. Subject to flooding and Ordnance Survey documents a spring.	Comments noted. Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the sHELAA, the site is not a preferred site due to loss of open gap in built up part of settlement.
754	Land West of Bucklesham Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	Site has major significance as flood plan, AONB, Scientific interest, meadow lands.	
754	Land West of Bucklesham Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	Objection on following grounds of Access/traffic (parking and road safety issues) and loss of wildlife habitat	
754	Land West of Bucklesham Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	Developments would have significant, environmental impact of what is a small community of Kirton. In the village setting, there is little in the way of light, traffic and noise pollution. Significant modern development would certainly change this community's sympathetic understanding of its surroundings.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
754	Land West of Bucklesham Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	I am aware that the farmer struggles to grow crops here due to the ground being water logged by an underground stream	
754	Land West of Bucklesham Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	Parish Council oppose use of land as this would lead to urbanisation of the green spaces between Ipswich and Felixstowe.	
754	Land West of Bucklesham Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	Should allow gradual development in proportion to what is already here. Some of the smaller sites should be looked at first.	
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Hopkins Homes	Development of this site would alter the character of the village by breaching the western side of Trimley Road.	Site is not proposed for allocation – its development would result in loss of open gap.
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for landscape, transport and schools. Query if site in agricultural use.	Addressed in Sustainability Appraisal. However site not selected as preferred for allocation.
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Trinity College, Cambridge	Land promoted for development	Site identified as a potentially suitable site in the SHELAA although

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						it is considered that site 1077 is more suitable for allocation as it would enable gaps in the built area to be retained.
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	STRONGLY NEGATIVE. SCDC reports it would increase pollution and the site is subject to flooding, it would impact major landscape sites. The size would impact the village greatly. Ribbon development would fragment village further.	Comments noted. The site is not a preferred site as site 1077 is more suitable for allocation. It is considered that site 1077 provides a more appropriate opportunity by retaining the open spaces in the built form of the settlement.
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	Site is too big an increase in the housing stock for the village and again Farm Land.	
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	Objection on following grounds - Access/traffic (parking and road safety issues) Cumulative impact Outlook Loss of high quality arable farm land - Britain is running out of land for food and faces a potential shortfall of two million	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					hectares by 2030 according to research undertaken by The University of Cambridge. Loss of wildlife habitat Totally inappropriate overdevelopment of a site Highways and drainage infrastructure inadequate	
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	Impact on local road network, safety of school children and public. Environmental issues would be obvious with such a large development and modern housing would not be in keeping with local housing.	
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	The road infrastructure is already at breaking point with dangerous bends and close to primary schools.	
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	Parish Council oppose use of land as this would lead to urbanisation of the green spaces between Ipswich and Felixstowe.	
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	Small part of site would make a good place to build	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					but need to consider impact on village green which is public land and uses by local people. There is no traffic problem in Kirton, cars are few and far between and the main problem is cars travelling too fast.	
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	Private individual	Development on this size would totally swamp the village. Site also has a major water main running under it.	
755	Land West of Trimley Road	Housing and Open Space	Kirton	SCC Highways	Footway along frontage with ped crossing and links to village centre	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
856	Land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for transport and schools.	Addressed in Sustainability Appraisal. However site not selected as preferred for allocation.
856	land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	STRONGLY NEGATIVE. Access would appear to be extremely difficult. It is believed to be near a sewage pump. Part of it is landfill.	Comments noted. Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft SHELAA however is not identified for allocation and it is noted that access in particular may be difficult to achieve.
856	land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site has major significance as flood plan, AONB, Scientific interest, meadow lands.	
856	land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Objection on following grounds - Access/traffic (parking and road safety issues) and loss of wildlife habitat	
856	land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site is outside of physical limits boundary, limited facilities in the village and increased pressure on noise, light and emissions with increased recreational pressure on roads, footpaths and sensitive areas.	
856	land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site is outside of physical limits boundary, limited facilities in the village and increased pressure on noise, light and emissions with increased recreational pressure on roads, footpaths and sensitive areas.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
856	land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site previously rejected due to bends in the road.	
856	land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site rejected previously and these reasons are still valid. I am totally against any further development in the village.	
856	land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Poor access via a single track on a dangerous bend.	
856	land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site would add excessive traffic and impact on the already sustained drainage and access issues.	
856	land to the rear of 76 - 86 Bucklesham Road	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site offered and rejected before. Site is set aside for wildlife.	
857	Land at 65 Bucklesham Road, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site has major significance as flood plain, AONB, Scientific interest, meadow lands.	
857	Land at 65 Bucklesham	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Objection on following grounds - Access/traffic	Site is below 0.2ha and is therefore below the

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road, Kirton				(parking and road safety issues) and loss of wildlife habitat.	site size threshold for consideration for allocation.
857	Land at 65 Bucklesham Road, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Farmer struggles to grow crops due to water becoming water logged.	
857	Land at 65 Bucklesham Road, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Should allow gradual development in proportion to what is already here. Some of the smaller sites in the centre of the village would be ones to look at first.	
857	Land at 65 Bucklesham Road, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	Parish Council oppose use of land as this would lead to urbanisation of the green spaces between Ipswich and Felixstowe.	
857	Land at 65 Bucklesham Road, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Do not wish to see 4 houses to the rear of my property which will lead to loss of view, reduced privacy and devaluing the property.	
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Hopkins Homes	Site has issues around access and flooding, and impact on setting of Grade II Listed Manor House.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for landscape, transport and schools.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment therefore Sustainability Appraisal not undertaken.
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site has major significance as flood plan, AONB, Scientific interest, meadow lands.	
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Objection on following grounds - Access/traffic (parking and road safety issues) Cumulative impact Loss of wildlife habitat Inappropriate overdevelopment of a site Highways and drainage infrastructure inadequate	
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site has been previously rejected due to bends in the road.	
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	STRONGLY NEGATIVE. SCDC point out it is close to an important listed building and it would impact major	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					landscape sites. Has surface water flooding. The size would impact the village greatly	
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site is outside of physical limits boundary, limited facilities in the village and increased pressure on noise, light and emissions with increased recreational pressure on roads, footpaths and sensitive areas.	
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Development of any size would totally swamp the village and should be considered "off limits"	
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Poor access to the site, Bucklesham Road is a single track with dangerous bends and poor visibility.	
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Would lead to excessive traffic, noise and further strained drainage.	
1037	Land adj. 14-32 Park Lane, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	SCC Highways	Footway improvements and potentially widening required on Park Lane	
1077	Land to the rear of 31-37	Housing	Kirton	Kirton and Falkenham	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive	Addressed in Sustainability Appraisal.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Bucklesham Road			Parish Council	effects for transport and schools.	
1077	Land to the rear of 31-37 Bucklesham Road, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Site has major significance as flood plain, AONB, Scientific interest, meadow lands.	The comments have been considered in identifying preferred sites. Whilst the site is not in the AONB, comments regarding landscape have been taken on board and Policy SCLP12.51 requires existing trees and hedgerows on the boundaries of the site to be retained. It is acknowledged that there is an area of surface water flooding in the south east of the site and development of the site will be expected to address this and it is expected that Sustainable Drainage Systems would be provided. This site has been selected as preferable to other sites in the village which
1077	Land to the rear of 31-37 Bucklesham Road, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Objection on following grounds, access/traffic (parking and road safety issues) ad loss of wildlife habitat.	
1077	Land to the rear of 31-37 Bucklesham Road, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Farmer struggles to grow crops due to water becoming water logged.	
1077	Land to the rear of 31-37 Bucklesham Road, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	NEGATIVE. SCDC point out it will increase emissions and it would impact major landscape sites. Has surface water flooding	
1077	Land to the rear of 31-37 Bucklesham Road, Kirton	Housing	Kirton	Private individual	Should allow gradual development, in proportion to what is already here. Some of the smaller sites in the centre of the village would be ones to look at first.	
1077	Land to the rear of 31-37	Housing	Kirton	Levington & Stratton	Parish Council oppose use of land as this would lead to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Bucklesham Road, Kirton			Hall Parish Council	urbanisation of the green spaces between Ipswich and Felixstowe.	would result in the loss of open views.
52	Land opposite Knodishall Primary School, Judith Avenue	Housing	Knodishall	Savills	Site promoted by landowner for residential use	Comments noted. The site is identified as a potential site in the Draft SHELAA however is not proposed for allocation due to access issues.
52	Land opposite Knodishall Primary School, Judith Avenue	Housing	Knodishall	SCC Highways	Significant improvements to Sloe Lane required plus footway and/or ped crossing on B1069	
405	Land off Snape Road	Housing + open space	Knodishall	Fielden Limited	Site promoted by landowner for residential use	Comments noted. Site identified as not potential as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to a settlement.
405	Land off Snape Road	Housing + open space	Knodishall	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Knodishall Common CWS. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	
960	Land to the south east of St Andrews Rd, Knodishall	Housing	Knodishall	Savills	Site neighbours listed buildings and any development will need to mitigate this impact.	Comment noted. The site is identified as not potential for allocation due to significant access issues. The assessment also identified heritage assets that would need

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						consideration by any applications if the site had been deemed suitable for allocation.
3	Land adjacent to Sizewell Sports and Social Club, King Georges Avenue	Housing	Leiston	Hopkins Homes Ltd	The access is not wide enough.	Comment noted. Access is identified as an issue in the SHELAA however the site is identified as potentially suitable.
3	Land adjacent to Sizewell Sports and Social Club, King Georges Avenue	Housing	Leiston	Leiston Town Council	Site was rejected during the production of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft SHELAA, the Council supports a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for planning for residential development for the period to 2036.
3	Land adjacent to Sizewell Sports and Social Club, King Georges Avenue	Housing	Leiston	SCC Highways	Direct access from King George's Avenue recommended. Contribution towards Station Road junction improvements may be required.	
254	Land rear 43-67 Abbey Road	Housing	Leiston	Hopkins Homes Ltd	The access is not wide enough.	Comment noted. Access is identified as an issue in the SHELAA however the site is identified as potentially suitable.
254	Land rear 43-67 Abbey Road	Housing	Leiston	SCC Highways	Improvement to access road required.	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						SHELAA, the Council supports a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for planning for residential development for the period to 2036.
255	132-136 Haylings Road	Housing / holiday homes	Leiston	Hopkins Homes Ltd	Site is heavily wooded and has ecological constraints.	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, the Council supports a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for planning for residential development for the period to 2036.
255	132-136 Haylings Road	Housing/Holiday Homes	Leiston	SCC Highways	Potential 30 mph speed limit extension required	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft SHELAA, the Council supports a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for planning for residential development

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						for the period to 2036.
498	Land at Red House Lane	Housing	Leiston	Hopkins Homes Ltd	Land promoted for development	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, the Council supports a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for planning for residential development for the period to 2036.
498	Land at Red House Lane, Leiston	Housing	Leiston	Leiston Town Council	Site is under construction for 70 units, earmarked as a reserve site in the next revision of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft SHELAA, the Council supports a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for planning for residential development for the period to 2036.
498	Land at Red House Lane, Leiston	Housing	Leiston	SCC Highways	Improvements to Red House Lane required. Contribution towards Station Rd signalised junction improvements as with other sites in Leiston	
545	Sizewell A Site, Nr Leiston	Office / Storage / Industry	Leiston	NDA and Magnox Ltd	Land promoted for development.	Site identified as potentially suitable however it was deemed that sites elsewhere in

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						the District would be more suitable for allocation to meet evidenced need.
634	Rear of 9 and 11 South Close and 49 Garrett Crescent	Housing	Leiston	Leiston Town Council	Desperate for Flagship to actually develop this site - waited 3 years so far	Comment noted. However site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA. The site is within the Physical Limits Boundary identified in the Leiston Neighbourhood Plan where the principle of development is accepted.
720	Caravan Park, King Georges Avenue	Housing	Leiston	Leiston Town Council	Remains designated for a touring caravan park and not for development - this should be removed	Comments noted however site identified as unavailable in the Draft SHELAA.
720	Caravan Park, King Georges Avenue	Housing	Leiston	Leiston Town Council	Statutory allotments and would have to be an exception site.	
722	Land adjacent to 112-128 Haylings Road	Housing	Leiston	Hopkins Homes Ltd	Sustainably located but appears to contain allotments. These would need to be surplus before development could be allocated.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
1056	Land opposite	Housing	Leiston	Leiston	Should the Secretary of	Comments noted. Site

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	52-74 St Margarets Crescent, Leiston			Town Council	State give permission, the site could potentially be suitable for modest development on half the land as long as the other half was gifted modern play equipment and given to the community for community use. The development would have to be approved in the next review of the Neighbourhood Plan however.	removed from assessment as it is designated as part of an allocation in the Leiston Neighbourhood Plan.
1056	Land opposite 52-74 St Margarets Crescent, Leiston	Housing	Leiston	SCC Highways	Appears access would be from Neale Close. Assessment of suitability of access point required.	
767	Abbey Farm	Housing/Office/Industry	Letheringham	Letheringham Parish Council	Proposed site is adjacent to listed church, Letheringham Priory and forms part of the Deben Valley area. Concerns related to scale of proposed development, pressure on existing resources and infrastructure and environmental factors.	Comment noted. Site identified as unsuitable in Draft SHELAA – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
1052	Land at The Street/Park Road	Housing	Letheringham	Letheringham Parish	Proposed site is high quality agricultural land, situated at	Comment noted. The site is identified as not

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
				Council	the centre of Letheringham. Site includes a quarry, important for local wildlife and faces listed cottages. Concerns related to scale or proposed development, pressure on existing resources and infrastructure and environmental factors.	available within the draft SHELAA.
1052	Land at The Street/Park Road	Housing	Letheringham	Private individual	Concern about the scale of the proposed development, impact on existing infrastructure and services and the environmental impact of the site coming forward.	
1052	Land at The Street/Park Road	Housing	Letheringham	Private individual	Oppose the development due to countryside location. Village is not a sustainable village and development of this scale would have a devastating impact in an area with no public house of shop, narrow roads and liable to flooding from the river Deben.	
1052	Land at The Street/Park Road	Housing	Letheringham	SCC Highways	Remote from local amenities and footways.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Significant improvements to sustainable links required.	
15	Land adjacent Levington Park, Bridge Road	Housing	Levington	Private Individual	Private Individual	Comments have been considered however the site is proposed for allocation due to representing a logical development within the general pattern of the current settlement which will contribute towards meeting the District's housing requirement. Levington is identified as a small village in the settlement hierarchy and therefore in principle development is considered appropriate. The issues addressed have been reflected in the policy, including requiring the design and layout to reflect the site's location in the AONB.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
15	Land adjacent Levington Park, Bridge Road	Housing	Levington	Private individual	Oppose on the grounds of the site directly abutting the AONB, proposed development is too big an increase for the village.	These comments have been considered however the site is proposed for allocation due to representing a logical development within the general pattern of the current settlement which will contribute towards meeting the District's housing requirement. Levington is identified as a small village in the settlement hierarchy and therefore in principle development is considered appropriate. The issues addressed have been reflected in the policy, including requiring the design and layout to reflect the site's location in the AONB.
15	Land adjacent Levington Park, Bridge Road	Housing	Levington	Private individual	Village could not support this potential development, sewerage system could not handle extra demands, detrimental effect on the AONB and current amenities do not support any further development.	
15	Land adjacent Levington Park, Bridge Road	Housing	Levington	Private individual	We feel that this site is not suitable for such development, primarily due to the lack of suitable local services in the village (no school, no shop, no Post Office, very limited village bus service on three days a week to Ipswich only).	
15	Land adjacent Levington Park, Bridge Road	Housing	Levington	Private individual	Consider that the construction of 22 new homes right on the boundary of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB to be inappropriate due to its proximity to the AONB.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
15	Land adjacent Levington Park, Bridge Road	Housing	Levington	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	The proposed 22 houses would be an increase of about 26% which would not be sufficient to add any further facilities to the village which would remain as minimal, hence the position of Levington in the Hierarchy of Settlements, and the initial site assessment by SCDC rightly mentions the site being near a bus stop, What it doesn't mention is that the bus service only operates three mornings a week, only to Ipswich, and the bus has a turnaround time of about two hours.	
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Private Individual	Development would result in loss of farmland and creation of an industrial belt between Ipswich and Felixstowe	Feedback acknowledged in relation to environmental impacts of such an extensive greenfield site. The site is not identified as a preferred allocation as it is considered that site 706 presents more benefits including
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Private Individual	Object to development due to loss of open space and agricultural land, urban sprawl, impacts on tourism, traffic and pollution and	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					infrastructure.	retaining the gap between Ipswich and Felixstowe.
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Stratton Hall Farms	Land promoted for development.	
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Private Individual	Completely unsuitable, would lead to creation of a developed corridor linking towns of Ipswich and Felixstowe.	Feedback acknowledged in relation to environmental impacts of such an extensive greenfield site. The site is not identified as a preferred allocation as it is considered that site 706 presents more benefits including retaining the gap between Ipswich and Felixstowe.
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Private individual	Alarmed by the potential linking of Ipswich and Felixstowe into one urban sprawl.	
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Private individual	Village could not support this potential development, sewerage system could not handle extra demands, detrimental effect on the AONB and current amenities do not support any further development.	Feedback acknowledged in relation to environmental impacts of such an extensive greenfield site. The site is not identified as a preferred allocation as it is considered that site 706 presents more benefits including retaining the gap between Ipswich and Felixstowe.
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	NEGATIVE. Will create pollution and traffic. Loss of agricultural land	
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Private individual	Any development on this site would have a huge impact on the properties surrounding including health and wellbeing, noise	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					and light pollution. Goes against the community well being policy and part of the land is designated SSSI. Strongly oppose any development of the land as it will have negative impact on the village and local communities.	
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	The land does not meet the criteria for the village in the Hierarchy of Settlements of development only being permitted on in-fill sites; and the land directly abuts the boundary of the AONB and does not provide any separation or hinterland to this specially protected area.	
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Private individual	The proposed industrial development would have a detrimental effect on our lifestyles, value of our properties and with consultation of local estate agents, this would likely deem our properties unsalable causing financial misfortune of the greatest kind.	
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	Private individual	Currently the A14 corridor between Ipswich and Felixstowe remains predominantly agricultural land, with discrete villages, Nacton, Brightwell, Bucklesham, Levington, Kirton, Trimley St Martin and St Mary existing as part of this rural infrastructure. There does not appear to be any rationale for industrial, employment and warehouse development. There should be no	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					creeping development along the Ipswich to Felixstowe corridor as this would impact on the AONB and threaten independent identify of villages.	
347	Land north west of Walk Farm	Off-port distribution facilities	Levington	SCC Highways	Left in left out currently, linked to 288 above. Would provide land for grade separated junction upgrade.	
50	Manor Farm, Little Bealings	Housing	Little Bealings	Little Bealings Parish Council	Considers Site Number 50 to be unsustainable for development, given that access is along an unmade track and there is no footway access within the village	Comments noted. Site not preferred for allocation. The strategy does not identify the small village of Little Bealings as a focus for growth.
50	Manor Farm, Little Bealings	Housing	Little Bealings	Private individual	Listed in potential land for development is number 50 Manor Farm Little Bealings. This is not a suitable site for housing development. The area is incorrectly illustrated on the map. It lies outside the village boundary. Access is poor onto a blind spot on the road. SCDC have previously	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					reviewed this area and deemed it not suitable for development.	
235	Land adjacent to 1 Holly Cottages, Holly Lane	Housing	Little Bealings	Little Bealings Parish Council	Understands that Site Number 235 is not proposed by the owner of at least 50% of the land, and, in any event, is too small for development.	Comments noted. Site not preferred for allocation. The strategy does not identify the small village of Little Bealings as a focus for growth.
235	Land adjacent to 1 Holly Cottages, Holly Lane	Housing	Little Bealings	Private individual	Part of the site is not available as access is only via a private driveway which is unviable, would deny access to an existing property and should be removed from the list.	
128	Land opposite 1-12 Streetfield	Housing	Little Glemham	Little Glemham Parish Council	Development on this site would completely change the character of the village.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
128	Land opposite 1-12 Streetfield	Housing	Little Glemham	SCC Highways	Necessary widening and footway provision on Church Road appears unfeasible	Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
729	Blaxhall Hall, Little Glenham	Housing/ Holiday Accomidation	Little Glemham	Blaxhall Parish Council	Parish Council in favour of development on this site provided the number of proposed homes is scaled	The site been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					back to around 10 properties.	Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
729	Blaxhall Hall, Little Glenham	Housing/ Holiday Accomodation	Little Glemham	Private individual	Support one or two self build cottages.	
729	Blaxhall Hall, Little Glenham	Housing/ Holiday Accomodation	Little Glemham	Blaxhall Commons and Open Spaces Charitable Trust	Development here would relate to the conversion of existing farm buildings. In this sense it would not directly impact on Blaxhall's commons and open spaces, although there are concerns about traffic generation and the suitability of this site in terms of sustainability	
361	Land at Parham Airfield	Light Industrial	Marlesford	Parham Parish Council	Council supported the development of Plot 361 for light industrial purposes in principle.	Comment noted. Identified for employment use in the Local Plan.
400	land at Ivy House Farm, Ashe Road	Residential and employment	Marlesford	Marlesford Parish Council	Parish Council would be supportive of non residential development	Marlesford is identified as being in the countryside and therefore non-residential uses would only be supported where in accordance with relevant policies relating to the countryside.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
5	land opposite The Red Lion, Main Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, in flood zone 2 and 3, pressure on estuaries and SPAs, impact on setting of grade II Listed Building, adjacent Special Landscape Area.	Comments noted. Site not preferred for allocation and the strategy for Martlesham recognises environmental constraints to growth towards the estuary and Woodbridge.
5	land opposite The Red Lion, Main Road	Housing	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	Development should be resisted within what we would argue is a cordon sanitaire. The conurbations must remain areas distinct and urban sprawl resisted	
5	land opposite The Red Lion, Main Road	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Site outside of the physical limits boundary, located within flood zone, will lead to increased recreational pressure on the Deben Estuary, adjacent to Special Landscape Area and impact on listed buildings.	
5	land opposite The Red Lion, Main Road	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Much of the area has been refused at appeal by a government officer. Issues resolved around flood plain, area of outstanding natural beauty, congestion,	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					coalescence and impact on environment.	
5	land opposite The Red Lion, Main Road	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Increased flood risk.	
117	Land adjacent Brook House, Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, in flood zone 2 and 3, pressure on estuaries and SPAs, TPOs, Grade II Listed Buildings	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
117	Land adjacent Brook House, Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	Development should be resisted within what we would argue is a cordon sanitaire. The conurbations must remain areas distinct and urban sprawl resisted	Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
117	Land adjacent Brook House, Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Site outside of the physical limits boundary, located within flood zone, will lead to increased recreational pressure on the Deben Estuary, adjacent to Special Landscape Area and impact on listed buildings and tree preservation orders	
117	Land adjacent Brook House,	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Would lead to loss of amenity land and impact on	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Bealings Road				wildlife.	
126	Land off Hall Road, Rear of The Chestnuts	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, County Wildlife Site, in flood zone 2 and 3, pressure on estuaries and SPAs, TPOs, Grade II Listed Buildings, in Special Landscape Area,	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
126	Land off Hall Road, Rear of The Chestnuts	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Exclude this site from development.	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
126	Land off Hall Road, Rear of The Chestnuts	Housing	Martlesham	Greenways Project	Unsuitable due to wildlife and landscape value and part of strategic separation between Martlesham and Kesgrave.	
126	Land off Hall Road, Rear of The Chestnuts	Housing	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	Development should be resisted within what we would argue is a cordon sanitaire. The conurbations must remain areas distinct and urban sprawl resisted	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA
126	Land off Hall Road, Rear of The Chestnuts	Housing	Martlesham	SCC Highways	Footway required on Hall Road is site accessed from there.	
142	Land North of 1-30 Woodside	Mixed use	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan	The site has been identified as not suitable

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
				Council	physical limits boundary, access issues, pressure on estuaries and SPAs, BAP species on site, coalescence between Martlesham and Waldringfield.	through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
142	Land North of 1-30 Woodside	Mixed use	Martlesham	Greenways Project	Unsuitable due to biodiversity, landscape and informal recreation value.	
142	Land North of 1-30 Woodside	Mixed use	Martlesham	Private individual	I strongly believe there should be a complete moratorium on all further building in or near Martlesham until the BT development is complete and an assessment made on all aspects of the impact to the infrastructure, including where these people will work and how they will get there	The site been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
142	Land North of 1-30 Woodside	Mixed use	Martlesham	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is woodland and any development here would appear to require the loss of this habitat, further assessment is required to determine the likely impacts of development at this site.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
142	Land North of 1-30 Woodside	Mixed use	Martlesham	Private individual	Much increased traffic on the immediate local roads that already struggle to cope (these would feed into Martlesham Heath to the east of the A12 where recent increases in retail/commercial development has already led to much increased traffic congestion),	
142	Land North of 1-30 Woodside	Mixed use	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Densely wooded area containing footpaths and TPO. Problems may be faced accessing site from Felixstowe Road or Waldringfield Road. Site within 1km of the Deben Estuary and would lead to coalescence between Martlesham and Waldringfield.	
142	Land North of 1-30 Woodside	Mixed use	Martlesham	Private individual	Development in this area would introduce unmanageable quantity of traffic into surrounding lanes, would damage the open and rural nature of Martlesham village and	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					community.	
142	Land North of 1-30 Woodside	Mixed use	Martlesham	Private individual	My main objection is about rainwater run-off into Viking Heights if the fields are built on. I also feel there will be a loss of the rural feel of the village and impact on walking and social activities for which most people live in the area, therefore ruining the quality of life for all those existing residence.	
142	Land North of 1-30 Woodside	Mixed use	Martlesham	Private individual	Building on this site will destroy the remaining rural feel of Martlesham village and substantially reduce quality of life of living here.	
175	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Football club	Housing	Martlesham	Armstrong Rigg Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation in Draft Local Plan. Relocation of the football club to an alternative location not demonstrated.
175	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Football club	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Impact on Deben Estuary, site outside of physical limits boundary, road access problems and the site is at high ground when viewed from the Fynn Valley.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
175	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Football club	Housing	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	We do not agree to this site.	
175	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Football club	Housing	Martlesham	Woodbridge Society	We understand that it is already agreed site is suitable for housing.	
175	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Football club	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Much of the area has been refused at appeal by a government officer. Issues resolved around flood plain, area of outstanding natural beauty, congestion, coalescence and impact on environment.	
175	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Football club	Housing	Martlesham	SCC Highways	Envisage an extension of Flynn Road.	
175	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Football club	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, pressure on estuaries and SPAs	
181	Land to the north of the Park & Ride site	Holiday accommodation	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary,	Comments noted. Site not allocated in Draft Local Plan. Relocation of the football club to an alternative location not demonstrated.
						Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					pressure on estuaries and SPAs, TPOs, Special Landscape Area.	Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
181	Land to the north of the Park & Ride site	Holiday accommodation	Martlesham	Private individual	Exclude this site from development.	
181	land to the north of the Park & Ride site	Holiday accomodation	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	Development should be resisted within what we would argue is a cordon sanitairre. The conurbations must remain areas distinct and urban sprawl resisted	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
181	land to the north of the Park & Ride site	Holiday accomodation	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Site located outside of the physical limits boundary, within a minerals consultation area, potential impact on Deben Estuary, within the SLA.	
181	land to the north of the Park & Ride site	Holiday accomodation	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Site is outside of the physical limits boundary, northern part of the site is covered by fluvial and tidal flood risk, increase from recreational pressure on the Deben Estuary, tree preservation orders and listed buildings.	
181	land to the north of the Park &	Holiday accomodation	Martlesham	Private individual	Would lead to loss of amenity land and impact on	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Ride site				wildlife	
189	Land adjacent to Bealings House, Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, in a Minerals Consultation Area, flood risk, pressure on estuaries and SPAs, TPOs, BAP species, Grade II Listed Building to north of site, within SLA.	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
220	Land at Walk Farm Cottage	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Unacceptable impact on Martlesham creek, Deben estuary, AONB, Ramsar, SPA, in SLA, outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary.	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
220	Land at Walk Farm Cottage	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Site is located within flood zone 1 and site is within 1km of the Deben Estuary and surrounded by Martlesham woods.	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
221	Gibraltar Farm, Private Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	In Minerals Consultation Area, pressure on estuaries and SPAs, In SLA, outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary.	Comments noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the district are more suitable for allocation. The Council supports the Neighbourhood Plan as

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						the mechanism for delivering allocations for development centred on the needs of the community.
221	Gibraltar Farm, Private Road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Site outside of the building line of Martlesham, designated countryside and in green belt. Site would be accessed through a totally inadequate access.	The site is not identified as a potential site in the Draft SHELAA.
221	Gibraltar Farm, Private Road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Site in a mineral consultation area, impact on Deben Estuary, within the SLA and outside of physical limits boundary.	
221	Gibraltar Farm, Private Road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Would lead to loss of amenity land and impact on wildlife. Access is poor.	
221	Gibraltar Farm, Private Road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Access is an unadopted and unmade road which is not very wide and unsuitable for any extra traffic, parking or turning of larger vehicles. Site was previously concluded unsuitable and it requires adequate mitigation. Building on a flood plan and land	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					designated countryside ought to be avoided.	
221	Gibraltar Farm, Private Road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Residents of Private Road and Shaw Valley Road	Access is via a single track unmade road, no scope to extend the width. Over 60% of the site is vulnerable to standing water and is outside of the building line of Martlesham village and is designated as countryside. Development in this area would unnecessarily affect the character of this part of the village.	
221	Gibraltar Farm, Private Road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Access is via a single track unadopted road, part of the site is flood plain and site is designated countryside.	
221	Gibraltar Farm, Private Road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	SCC Highways	Private road does not appear suitable to accommodate traffic and ped movements	
329	Land at Collies, 3 Stiles Lane	Physical limits extension	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Potential for pressure on SPA, outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, no reference in Sustainability Appraisal.	
329	Land at Collies, 3	Not specified	Martlesham	District	Site is within 1km of Deben	The site is not available for consideration for development in the Draft Local Plan.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Stiles Lane			Councillor Kelso	Estuary, outside of the physical limits boundary.	
330	Land at Little Thrift, Felixstowe Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, part of site in Minerals Consultation Area, potential for pressure on SPA, close to Doctor Brittain's wood.	Comments noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the district are more suitable for allocation. The Council supports the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for delivering allocations for development
330	Land at Little Thrift, Felixstowe Road	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Site is located outside of the physical limits boundary, increased pressure on Deben Estuary and very close to Doctor Brittan's wood.	
331	Land south Bloomfield's Farm, Black Tiles Lane	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Site has planning permission	Comment noted. The site is not a potential site as it has planning permission.
331	Land south Bloomfield's Farm, Black Tiles Lane	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Site already has planning permission for 47 homes.	
333	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Town FC, A12	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, pressure on estuaries and SPAs	Comments noted. Site not allocated in Draft Local Plan. Relocation of the football club to an alternative location not demonstrated.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
333	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Town FC, A12	Recreation facility	Martlesham	Private individual	Issues resolved around flood plan, areas of outstanding natural beauty, congestion, coalescence and impact on the environment.	See comments under 175.
333	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Town FC, A12	Recreation facility	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	The conurbations must remain areas distinct and urban sprawl resisted.	
333	Land at and surrounding Woodbridge Town FC, A12	Recreation facility	Martlesham	Woodbridge Society	We understand that it is already agreed site is suitable for housing	
344	Land immediately south of railway line, Top Street	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Planning permission refused on appeal for this site.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
344	Land immediately south of railway line, Top Street	Housing (assumed)	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	We do not agree to this site.	Comments noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
344	Land immediately south of railway line, Top Street	Housing (assumed)	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Outside of the physical limits boundary, located within tidal flood zone, increased pressure on the Deben Estuary, within the SLA and close to listed	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					buildings and TPO.	
344	Land immediately south of railway line, Top Street	Housing (assumed)	Martlesham	Private individual	Site dismissed for housing development at Public Hearing, adverse effect on granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.	
344	Land immediately south of railway line, Top Street	Housing (assumed)	Martlesham	Private individual	Much of the area has been refused at appeal by a government officer. Issues resolved around flood plain, area of outstanding natural beauty, congestion, coalescence and impact on environment.	
355	Land south of The Chestnuts, Hall Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, site in Minerals Consultation Area, potential for pressure on SPA, TPOs, BAP species, in SLA.	Comments noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
355	Land south of The Chestnuts, Hall Road	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Exclude this site from development.	
355	Land south of The Chestnuts,	Housing	Martlesham	Greenways Project	Unsuitable due to wildlife and landscape value and	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Hall Road				separation between Kesgrave and Martlesham.	
355	Land south of The Chestnuts, Hall Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, site in Minerals Consultation Area, potential for pressure on SPA, TPOs, BAP species, in SLA.	Comments noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
355	Land south of The Chestnuts, Hall Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Exclude this site from development.	
355	Land south of The Chestnuts, Hall Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Unsuitable due to wildlife and landscape value and separation between Kesgrave and Martlesham.	
355	Land south of The Chestnuts, Hall Road	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Long history of planning refusals for sites at and near this location, outside of the physical limits boundary, impact on Deben Estuary, within the SLA.	Comment noted.Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA
452	Land off Duke's Park	Housing / Retail	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Should be shown as in Martlesham, not Woodbridge. Site refused on appeal. In Minerals Consultation Area, surface water flooding, potential for pressure on SPA, adjoins	Site identified as not suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, constraints regarding protection of settlement

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					AONB, 2 BAP species on site, Grade II Listed Building to west of site, TPO on eastern boundary.	gap.
452	Land off Duke's Park	Housing / Retail	Martlesham	Private individual	Should be rejected due to coalescence between Martlesham and Woodbridge.	
470	The Chestnuts, Hall Road	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Exclude from development.	Comments noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the district are more suitable for allocation. The Council supports the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for delivering allocations for development centred on the needs of the community.
470	The Chestnuts, Hall Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Potential for pressure on SPA, outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, in Minerals Consultation Area, TPO on north and west boundaries, protected flora and fauna, Grade II Listed Building, in SLA.	
470	The Chestnuts, Hall Road	Housing	Martlesham	Greenways Project	Unsuitable due to wildlife and landscape value and separation between Kesgrave and Martlesham.	
470	The Chestnuts, Hall Road	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Long history of planning refusals for sites at and near this location, outside of the physical limits boundary, impact on Deben Estuary, within the SLA.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						review of the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for delivering allocations for development.
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Loss of agricultural land, surface water flooding, potential for pressure on SPA, coalescence between Martlesham and Waldringfield.	Comments noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the district are more suitable for allocation. The Council supports the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for delivering allocations for development centred on the needs of the community.
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Land promoted for development	
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Loss of high quality agricultural land, within flood zone 1, abuts protected woodland, outside of the physical limits boundary and may lead to coalescence between Martlesham and Waldringfield.	Comments noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the District are more suitable for allocation. The Council supports a review of the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for delivering allocations for development.
533	Land East of Felixstowe road,	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	I strongly believe there should be a complete	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Martlesham				moratorium on all further building in or near Martlesham until the BT development is complete and an assessment made on all aspects of the impact to the infrastructure, including where these people will work and how they will get there	
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	RSPB	Development in this area could result in increased recreational disturbance to the adjacent Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site. Any proposed allocation must undergo HRA to consider the potential impacts of new development close to these sites and ensure that they are not adversely affected.	
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	The site is currently arable farmland and provides a rural escape used by many people: walkers, dog walkers, horse riders etc. A development of the size suggested would destroy	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					this very pleasant environment	
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Landform Estates Limited	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Object to site on grounds of water runoff, area already struggling to cope with increase in vehicles, access and parking, loss of green spaces, improvements needed to services and facilities, joining of Martlesham and Woodbridge	
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Serious concern about unmanageable quantity of traffic, damage to open space and rural nature of Martlesham, impact of run off and drainage.	
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	My main objection is about rainwater run-off into Viking Heights if the fields are built on. I also feel there will be a loss of the rural feel of the village and impact on walking and social activities for which	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					most people live in the area, therefore ruining the quality of life for all those existing residence	
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	A major issue is drainage to Viking Heights	
533	Land East of Felixstowe road, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	SCC Highways	Footways and potentially widening of Felixstowe road required	
683	Land at Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, loss of agricultural land, within Minerals Consultation Area, flood risk, potential for pressure on SPA, in SLA.	Comments noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of the settlement.
683	Land at Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Outside of physical limits, loss of agricultural land, flood risk, impact on Deben Estuary and within the SLA.	Comments noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of the settlement.
683	Land at Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	SCC Highways	Footway link towards The Street required. Long distance and narrow so may not be feasible.	
734	Bloomfield's Farm, Black Tiles Lane,	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Site outside of the physical limits boundary, half of the site is within an old landfill,	Comment noted. The site is not a potential site due to significant

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Martlesham				impact on Deben Estuary and within SLA.	access constraints.
734	Bloomfield's Farm, Black Tiles Lane	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, partly former landfill, potential for pressure on SPA, in SLA.	Comment noted. The site is not a potential site due to significant access constraints.
735	Bloomfield's Farm, Black Tiles Lane	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Planning permission granted	Comments noted. The site is not a potential site due to existing planning permission on the site.
735	Bloomfield's Farm, Black Tiles Lane	Housing	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	We do not agree to this site	Comments noted. The site is not a potential site due to existing planning permission on the site.
735	Bloomfield's Farm, Black Tiles Lane	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Planning permission already granted for 47 homes.	
735	Bloomfield's Farm, Black Tiles Lane	Housing	Martlesham	SCC Highways	Investigation required into suitability of Black Tiles Lane to serve additional development.	
781	Land Fronting Top Street and Sandy Lane	Residential/Care home/Office/Industry	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Adj site dismissed on appeal. Loss of agricultural land, potential for pressure on SPA, in AONB, coalescence between Martlesham and	Comments noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of the settlement.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Woodbridge.	Additionally, coalescence is also considered a significant issue.
781	Land Fronting Top Street and Sandy Lane	Residential/Care home/Office/Industry	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Should be rejected due to coalescence between Martlesham and Woodbridge.	
781	Land Fronting Top Street and Sandy Lane	Housing/Care home/Office/Industry	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	We do not agree to this site	Comments noted. The site is not a potential site as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the built form of the settlement. Additionally, coalescence is also considered a significant issue.
781	Land Fronting Top Street and Sandy Lane	Housing/Care home/Office/Industry	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	New site October 2016	
781	Land Fronting Top Street and Sandy Lane	Housing/Care home/Office/Industry	Martlesham	Private individual	Applications in the past have been refused as it would lead to a conurbation from Ipswich to Woodbridge.	
781	Land Fronting Top Street and Sandy Lane	Housing/Care home/Office/Industry	Martlesham	Private individual	South of the railway line would lead to coalescence between Martlesham and Woodbridge, besides being unsuitable for other reasons that were cited in objections to the development of Land Fronting Top Street raised previously by local residents and at the Hearing.	
781	Land Fronting	Housing/Care	Martlesham	Private	Much of this area has	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Top Street and Sandy Lane	home/Office/Industry		individual	already been refused at appeal – any development will impact negatively on the wheelchair and pushchair friendly walking route from Old Martlesham to Woodbridge. Would break a natural feeding corridor for birds of prey and small mammals, coalescence will also impact the uniqueness of Woodbridge and its importance as a tourist destination.	
920	Land south of Ipswich Road	Mixed use	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Prominent site, surface water flooding, windfarm electrical feed crosses site, potential for pressure on SPA, outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary.	The site is not made available for consideration for development in the Draft Local Plan.
920	Land south of Ipswich Road	Mixed Use	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	We do not agree to this site	The site is not made available for consideration for development in the Draft Local Plan.
920	Land south of Ipswich Road	Mixed Use	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Very prominent site overlooking Fynn Valley, within flood zone 1, site being crossed with	The site is not made available for consideration for development in the Draft Local Plan.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					windfarm electrical feed and outside of the physical limits boundary.	
920	Land south of Ipswich Road	Mixed Use	Martlesham	Private individual	Site not suitable for development.	
920	Land south of Ipswich Road	Mixed Use	Martlesham	Private individual	Much of this area has been refused at appeal, issues revolved around flood plain, area of outstanding natural beauty, congestion, coalescence and impact on the environment.	
940	Shawfields and Little Shaws, Shaw Valley Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Potential for pressure on SPA	The site is not made available for consideration for development in this Draft Local Plan.
940	Shawfields and Little Shaws, Shaw Valley Road	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Access is an unadopted and unmade road which is not very wide and unsuitable for any extra traffic, parking or turning of larger vehicles. Site was previously concluded unsuitable and it requires adequate mitigation. Building on a flood plan and land designated countryside ought to be avoided.	The site is not made available for consideration for development in this Draft Local Plan.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
940	Shawfields and Little Shaws, Shaw Valley Road	Housing	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	Outside of the physical limits boundary, accessed via private unsurfaced road, potential for increased pressure on Deben Estuary.	
940	Shawfields and Little Shaws, Shaw Valley Road	Housing	Martlesham	Residents of Private Road and Shaw Valley Road	Access is via a single track unmade road, no scope to extend the width. Over 60% of the site is vulnerable to standing water and is outside of the building line of Martlesham village and is designated as countryside. Development in this area would unnecessarily affect the character of this part of the village.	
940	Shawfields and Little Shaws, Shaw Valley Road	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Development on this site would have an unnecessary negative impact on the character of this attractive part of Martlesham and we do urge you to REFUSE permission to proceed with either scheme.	
952	Land at Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside physical limits boundary, within minerals consultation area, TPO, Listed Buildings, in SLA.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
952	land at Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Permission granted already for barn conversions, outside of physical limits boundary, within the SLA and TPOs on site.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
999	Suffolk Police HQ, Portal Avenue	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Brownfield site within physical limits boundary. Careful consideration needed for new development to be well separated from housing. Consider juxtaposition with PIC. Portal Woodlands is a TPO and contains protected species. Development to be in line with Neighbourhood Plan.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
999	Suffolk Police	Housing	Martlesham	Private	Exclude site from	Site identified as

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	HQ, Portal Avenue			individual	development	unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
999	Suffolk Police HQ, Portal Avenue, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	We do not agree to this site	Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
999	Suffolk Police HQ, Portal Avenue, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor Kelso	Brownfield site, which physical boundary, careful consideration would need to be given for any new development to be well separated from existing housing, any development to fall in line with the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.	
999	Suffolk Police HQ, Portal Avenue, Martlesham	Housing	Martlesham	SCC Highways	Sustainable links to Kesgrave and Martlesham required.	
1018	Land at Anson Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Large area of surface water flooding, County Wildlife Site, rare wildlife in adjacent wood.	Site identified as potentially suitable however the Local Plan provides an opportunity for a review of the Neighbourhood Plan to identify additional sites.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
1018	Land at Anson Road, Martlesham Heath	Housing	Martlesham	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site includes part of Martlesham Common CWS, any development here should protect the CWS.	Site identified as potentially suitable however the Local Plan provides an opportunity for a review of the Neighbourhood Plan to identify additional sites.
1018	Land at Anson Road, Martlesham Heath	Housing	Martlesham	Woodbridge Town Council	Large portion of the site at risk from surface water flooding, site is also a County Wildlife Site.	
1072	Land inc. superstore, Parish rooms & Beardmore Retail Park, Martlesham	District Centre	Martlesham	SCC Highways	Likely to be affected by proposed Adastral park development. Additional development in this area may be subject to cumulative impact study.	Comment noted.Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA
1076	Land to the rear of Willow Brook House, Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	Martlesham Parish Council	Outside of Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan physical limits boundary, within Minerals Consultation Area, flooding on site, potential for pressure on SPA, TPO, BAP species, Grade II Listed Building, in SLA.	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
1076	land to the rear of Willow Brook House, Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	Private individual	Would lead to loss of amenity land and impact on wildlife, access is poor.	Comment noted.Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA
1076	land to the rear of Willow Brook	Housing	Martlesham	District Councillor	Outside of the physical limits boundary, tidal flood	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	House, Bealings Road			Kelso	zone, increased pressure on the Deben Estuary, within the SLA, close to Listed Buildings and TPO.	
1076	land to the rear of Willow Brook House, Bealings Road	Housing	Martlesham	SCC Highways	Private road does not appear suitable to accommodate traffic and ped movements	
42	The Coalyard, Wilford Bridge Road	Housing	Melton	Woodbridge Society	Small site and suitable for development.	Comment noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
136	Land adjacent to 6 Deben Way	Employment	Melton	Woodbridge Society	Small site and suitable for development.	Comment noted. Site not preferred for allocation.
210	land at Long Springs, Woods Lane	Housing	Melton	Private individual	Development would have a high impact on Woods Lane, Air quality is an issue for residents.	Comment noted. Site not preferred for allocation.
210	land at Long Springs, Woods Lane	Housing	Melton	Private individual	Site is not appropriate for development as majority of land is under a TPO.	
210	land at Long Springs, Woods Lane	Housing	Melton	SCC Highways	May impact upon Melton crossroads without mitigation or improvement to junction	
276	Land West of Brick Kiln Lane	Mixed Use	Melton	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to	Comment noted. Site not preferred for allocation.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					result in an adverse impact on Deben Estuary SPA, Ramsar and SSSI adjacent.	
276	Land West of Brick Kiln Lane	Mixed Use	Melton	Woodbridge Society	No objection to the site	
276	Land West of Brick Kiln Lane	Mixed Use	Melton	RSPB	If residential development is included, careful consideration of potential recreational impacts will be required due to their proximity to the designated sites.	
276	Land West of Brick Kiln Lane	Mixed Use	Melton	SCC Highways	Access proximity to level crossing, road alignment change may be required. Potential impact upon nearby signalised junction may be unacceptable without mitigation.	
292	Land South of Saddlemaker's Lane, Melton	Housing and Open Space	Melton	Private individual	Development would have a high impact on Woods Lane, Air quality is an issue for residents.	Comments noted. Infrastructure constraints including Melton Crossroads. Made neighbourhood earmarks a site for new homes.
292	Land South of Saddlemaker's Lane, Melton	Housing and Open Space	Melton	Woodbridge Society	Site is a rural part of Melton and should not be developed.	
292	Land South of Saddlemaker's Lane, Melton	Housing and Open Space	Melton	Private individual	Development on this site would contribute to the overloading of already	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					fragile road infrastructure. Poor air quality and traffic pollution is already an issue at Melton crossroads.	
346	Land east of former Girdlestons factory site, Station Road	Mixed Use	Melton	RSPB	If residential development is included, careful consideration of potential recreational impacts will be required due to their proximity to the designated sites.	Comments noted. Infrastructure constraints including Melton Crossroads. Made neighbourhood earmarks a site for new homes.
346	Land east of former Girdlestons factory site, Station Road	Mixed Use	Melton	Woodbridge Society	No objection to the site	
346	Land east of former Girdlestons factory site, Station Road	Mixed Use	Melton	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on Deben Estuary SPA, Ramsar and SSSI adjacent.	
346	Land east of former Girdlestons factory site, Station Road	Mixed Use	Melton	SCC Highways	Access proximity to level crossing, road alignment change may be required. Potential impact upon nearby signalised junction may be unacceptable	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					without mitigation.	
408	Land to the North of Woods Lane	Housing	Melton	Richborough Estates	Land promoted for development.	Site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. The Local Plan would support a review of the Neighbourhood Plan in bringing forward additional allocations.
408	Land to the North of Woods Lane	Housing	Melton	Hopkins Homes	Land promoted for development.	
408	Land to the North of Woods Lane	Housing	Melton	Private individual	Site is not appropriate for development as they would add to the already overloaded traffic infrastructure of Woods Lane a vital artery for Melton, Woodbridge and the coastal communities	Comments noted. Infrastructure constraints including Melton Crossroads. Made neighbourhood earmarks a site for new homes.
408	Land to the North of Woods Lane	Housing	Melton	Woodbridge Society	Site suitable for development.	
408	Land to the North of Woods Lane	Housing	Melton	Private individual	Development would have a high impact on Woods Lane, Air quality is an issue for residents.	
490	Valley Farm	Housing/ retirement village	Melton	Private	Site is not appropriate for	Comments noted.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Melton Woodbridge			individual	development as they would add to the already overloaded traffic infrastructure of Woods Lane a vital artery for Melton, Woodbridge and the coastal communities	Infrastructure constraints including Melton Crossroads. Made neighbourhood earmarks a site for new homes.
490	Valley Farm Melton Woodbridge	Housing/ retirement village	Melton	Woodbridge Society	Site should not be developed as this will lead to ribbon development north of A12.	
490	Valley Farm Melton Woodbridge	Housing/ retirement village	Melton	Private individual	Development would have a high impact on Woods Lane, Air quality is an issue for residents.	
490	Valley Farm Melton Woodbridge	Housing/ retirement village	Melton	SCC Highways	Valley Farm Rd unsuitable for access. Direct access onto Woods Lane (or A12 if linked to adjacent sites). May impact upon Melton crossroads without mitigation or improvement to junction	
539	Land North of Woods Lane Melton Woodbridge	Housing/ Care Home/ Open Space/ Office	Melton	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in additional adverse impacts on the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					neighbouring nature reserve.	homes.
539	Land North of Woods Lane Melton Woodbridge	Housing/ Care Home/ Open Space/ Office	Melton	SCC Highways	Access via A12. Potentially significant investment to provide suitable junction layout.	
645	Land at Yarmouth Road, Melton	Housing/ Care Home/ Open Space	Melton	Woodbridge Society	Site should not be developed	Comments noted. Infrastructure constraints including Melton Crossroads. Made neighbourhood earmarks a site for new homes.
645	Land at Yarmouth Road, Melton	Housing/ Care Home/ Open Space	Melton	SCC Highways	No further comments - site subject to recent planning process.	
826	Land between St Andrews Place and El Paso, Brick Kiln Lane	Mixed use	Melton	Woodbridge Society	No objection to the site	Comments noted. Infrastructure constraints including Melton Crossroads. Made neighbourhood earmarks a site for new homes.
826	Land between St Andrews Place and El Paso, Brick Kiln Lane	Mixed use	Melton	RSPB	If residential development is included, careful consideration of potential recreational impacts will be required due to their proximity to the designated sites.	
826	Land between St Andrews Place and El Paso, Brick Kiln Lane	Mixed use	Melton	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					result in an adverse impact on Deben Estuary SPA, Ramsar and SSSI adjacent.	
826	Land between St Andrews Place and El Paso, Brick Kiln Lane	Mixed use	Melton	SCC Highways	Access through minor residential roads. Potential impact upon nearby signalised junction may be unacceptable without mitigation.	
993	Council Offices, Melton Hill, Melton/Woodbridge	Housing	Melton	Private individual	Any further housing development on the outskirts of Woodbridge would adversely affect those currently living in Woodbridge and tourists wishing to visit the town. To maintain the vibrancy of the town and the economic viability of retailers, and to encourage tourism, it is essential that parking needs are catered for: parking in Woodbridge Town Centre is at capacity now and any further imposition upon it would discourage participation by local residents in the life of the town and discourage	Comments noted. Infrastructure constraints including Melton Crossroads. Made neighbourhood earmarks a site for new homes.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					tourists from visiting it.	
993	Council Offices, Melton Hill, Melton/Woodbridge	Housing	Melton	Woodbridge Town Council	Agreed as it is in the boundary of the town and sustainable within the true sense of the word	
993	Council Offices, Melton Hill, Melton/Woodbridge	Housing	Melton	Woodbridge Society	Already been agreed suitable for housing.	
993	Council Offices, Melton Hill, Melton/Woodbridge	Housing	Melton	RSPB	Any development at this site requires full HRA, and in our opinion, is likely to require mitigation to ensure no adverse effect on the designated sites	
993	Council Offices, Melton Hill, Melton/Woodbridge	Housing	Melton	SCC Highways	Refer to recent planning application comments.	
1059	Land adj. The Woodlands, Valley Farm Lane, Melton	Housing	Melton	Woodbridge Society	Site in rural part of Melton and should not be developed.	Comments noted. Infrastructure constraints including Melton Crossroads. Made neighbourhood earmarks a site for new homes.
1059	Land adj. The Woodlands, Valley Farm Lane, Melton	Housing	Melton	Private individual	Development would have a high impact on Woods Lane, Air quality is an issue for residents.	
1059	Land adj. The Woodlands,	Housing	Melton	Private individual	Would contribute to overloading of an already	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Valley Farm Lane, Melton				fragile road, poor air quality and traffic pollution is already an issues as identified in Melton Neighbourhood Plan.	
1059	Land adj. The Woodlands, Valley Farm Lane, Melton	Housing	Melton	SCC Highways	Valley Farm Rd unsuitable for access.	
1073	land to the rear of Fernhill Lodge, Woods Lane, Melton	Housing	Melton	Woodbridge Town Council	This looks reasonable but we don't want the A12 corridor being used for ribbon development.	Comments noted. Infrastructure constraints including Melton Crossroads. Made neighbourhood earmarks a site for new homes.
1073	land to the rear of Fernhill Lodge, Woods Lane, Melton	Housing	Melton	Private individual	Development would have a high impact on Woods Lane, Air quality is an issue for residents.	
1073	land to the rear of Fernhill Lodge, Woods Lane, Melton	Housing	Melton	Private individual	Would contribute to overloading of an already fragile road, poor air quality and traffic pollution is already an issues as identified in Melton Neighbourhood Plan.	
1073	land to the rear of Fernhill Lodge, Woods Lane, Melton	Housing	Melton	Woodbridge Society	Small site and suitable for development.	
47	Land adjacent to	Housing	Middleton	Middleton	Site is not suitable, poor	The site is not made

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Contrive Cottage, Mill Street			cum Fordley Parish Council	narrow access and doubt whether a workable solution could be achieved.	available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
155	Land to the rear of Bank House, Mill Street	Housing	Middleton	Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council	Small piece of backland, totally unsuitable for development.	Comment noted. Site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan. Furthermore, the site is not considered a suitable scale for allocation.
243	Land adjacent to Vine Cottage	Housing	Middleton	Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council	Site already has consent for a single dwelling.	Comment noted. Site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
243	Land adjacent to Vine Cottage	Housing	Middleton	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Minsmere Valley Reckford Bridge to Beveriche Manor CWS. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	Furthermore, the site is not considered a suitable scale for allocation.
348	Land east of The Old Rectory, Back Road	Housing	Middleton	Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council	Site has considerable ecological and landscape value and is liable to flood. It is simply a non-starter.	Comment noted. Site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
348	Land east of The	Housing	Middleton	Suffolk	Site is within Minsmere	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Old Rectory, Back Road			Wildlife Trust	Valley Reckford Bridge to Beveriche Manor CWS and development would therefore result in a loss of CWS.	
406	land south of Back Road	Housing	Middleton	Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council	Site not suitable for general housing development, but can see scope for limited development of mainly affordable housing as an exception site.	Comment noted. Site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan. Furthermore, access is considered a significant constraint.
484	Beveriche Manor Farm, Moor Road	Housing	Middleton	Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council	Site is in open countryside, well out of the village and is unsustainable by any reckoning.	Comment noted. The site is identified as not potential as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to a settlement.
961	Land at Mill Street, Middleton	Housing	Middleton	Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council	Site lies at the periphery of the built up area, but fronts a single-track road, which already suffers from congestion.	Comment noted. The site has been identified as not potential as it has only been made available for one dwelling and so is of a scale unsuitable for allocation.
1043	Land South of Back Road, fronting	Housing	Middleton	Middleton cum Fordley Parish	Two applications refused in the past five years. Believe that access as proposed by	Comments noted. The site has been identified as not potential due to

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Fletchers Lane, Middleton			Council	the developer is acceptable.	significant constraints regarding access.
1043	Land South of Back Road, fronting Fletchers Lane, Middleton	Housing	Middleton	Landbridge	Site is well located and forms a natural extension to the built environment. Site is suitable, achievable and capable of delivery.	
309	Land at New Dawn and Shenandoah, Chediston Green	Housing	Monewden	Cretingham, Monewden & Hoo Parish Council	It is requested that this land be taken out of the local plan please as being totally unsuitable and unsustainable.	Comment noted. he site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the District are more suitable for allocation.
807	Land east of the Moat House, Rookery Road	Affordable housing	Monewden	Cretingham, Monewden & Hoo Parish Council	It is requested that this land be taken out of the local plan please as being totally unsuitable and unsustainable.	Comments noted.Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA
807	Land east of the Moat House, Rookery Road	Affordable housing	Monewden	SCC Highways	Adjacent roads narrow without footways. Widening and footways required to accommodate developments of this scale.	
769	Land Adjacent to The Meadows	Housing	Monewden	Cretingham, Monewden & Hoo Parish Council	It is requested that this land be taken out of the local plan please as being totally unsuitable and unsustainable.	Comment noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the District are more suitable for allocation.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
808	land to the South of The Meadows	Affordable housing	Monewden	Cretingham, Monewden & Hoo Parish Council	It is requested that this land be taken out of the local plan please as being totally unsuitable and unsustainable	The site is not made available for development in the Draft Local Plan.
808	land to the South of The Meadows	Affordable housing	Monewden	SCC Highways	Adjacent roads narrow without footways. Widening and footways required to accommodate developments of this scale	
809	Land adjacent to St Mary's Church, Church Road	Housing	Monewden	Cretingham, Monewden & Hoo Parish Council	It is requested that this land be taken out of the local plan please as being totally unsuitable and unsustainable	The site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
809	Land adjacent to St Mary's Church, Church Road	Housing	Monewden	SCC Highways	Adjacent roads narrow without footways. Widening and footways required to accommodate developments of this scale	
186	Land adjacent to the Sheperd and Dog Piggeries, Felixstowe Road	Employment	Nacton	Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council	Consider site appropriate	Site part of existing allocation SSP20
566	Land at Orwell	Housing	Nacton	Artisan PPS	Site promoted by	Comments noted. The

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Park Gardens, off Church Road, IP10 OEW			Ltd	landowner for residential use.	site is not identified as a potential site in the Draft SHELAA reflecting that it is adjacent grade 2 listed Orwell School and Observatory. Part of the locally identified historic park and garden of Orwell Park. Brick boundary walls to 2 elevations are a non designated heritage asset.
285	Land rear of The Old Piggery, Mill Road	Mixed Use	Newbourne	Pomery Planning Consultants	Site promoted for residential or employment development by landowner.	Comments noted. There are specific policies in the Draft Plan that reflect the unique character of Newbourne.
285	Land rear of The Old Piggery, Mill Road	Mixed Use	Newbourne	Private individual	Site has excellent potential for mixed development, currently a brownfield horticultural site.	
285	Land rear of The Old Piggery, Mill Road	Mixed Use	Newbourne	Private individual	Site outside of the village envelope, overlooks SSSI and nature reserve and brown field site. At present site is open and raw and	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					would need careful boundary planting to reduce impact.	
396	land to the rear of 4 Ipswich Road	Housing and leisure	Newbourne	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Newbourne Springs SSSI and Suffolk Wildlife Trust reserve. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	Comments reflected in the site not being allocated for development. Impact on nature reserve and SSSI. The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
396	land to the rear of 4 Ipswich Road	Housing and leisure	Newbourne	Private individual	Entirely inappropriate for development, outside of village envelope and could have disastrous effect on nearby SSSI and nature reserve.	
396	land to the rear of 4 Ipswich Road	Housing and leisure	Newbourne	Private individual	Site outside of the village envelope, overlooks SSSI and nature reserve and brown field site. At present site is open and raw and would need careful boundary planting to reduce impact.	
501	Newbourne	Housing	Newbourne	Newbourne	The Parish Council would	Comments noted. There

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Business Park, Mill Road, IP12 4NP			Parish Council	like to know the plans for the site before objecting or supporting this.	are specific policies in the Draft Plan that reflect the unique character of Newbourne.
501	Newbourne Business Park, Mill Road, IP12 4NP	Housing	Newbourne	Private individual	Potential development for this site is logical and long overdue.	
501	Newbourne Business Park, Mill Road, IP12 4NP	Housing	Newbourne	Private individual	Site outside of the village envelope, overlooks SSSI and nature reserve and brown field site. At present site is open and raw and would need careful boundary planting to reduce impact.	
501	Newbourne Business Park, Mill Road, IP12 4NP	Housing	Newbourne	Evolution Town Planning	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	
504	Newbourne Business Park, Mill Road	Housing	Newbourne	Evolution Town Planning	Site is previously developed land and promoted for housing.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						proximity to Brightwell Lakes, it is not considered appropriate to allocate sites in the Local Plan
40	Land opposite Daphne House, Daphne Road	Housing	Orford	Private individual	Object to the site, it is in flood zone and any new buildings would not be in character with the village.	Comments noted and the site is not proposed for allocation. It is understood to have capacity for only 1 dwelling.
40	Land opposite Daphne House, Daphne Road	Housing	Orford	Private individual	Object to the development in terms of flood risk, loss of amenity, increase traffic and access across a registered village green	
40	Land opposite Daphne House, Daphne Road	Housing	Orford	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is in close proximity to the Alde-Ore Estuary SPA, Alde-Ore and Butley Estuaries SAC, Alde-Ore Estuary Ramsar site and the Alde-Ore Estuary SSSI. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	
410	land south of Daphne Road	Housing	Orford	Private individual	Object to the site, it is in flood zone and any new buildings would not be in	The site is not made available for consideration for

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					character with the village.	development in this Draft Local Plan.
410	land south of Daphne Road	Housing	Orford	Private individual	Object to the development in terms of flood risk, loss of amenity, increase traffic and access across a registered village green	
410	land south of Daphne Road	Housing	Orford	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is in close proximity to the Alde-Ore Estuary SPA, Alde-Ore and Butley Estuaries SAC, Alde-Ore Estuary Ramsar site and the Alde-Ore Estuary SSSI. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	Comment noted. Site not proposed for allocation reflecting vehicle access.
540	Land off Daphne Road	Housing	Orford	Private individual	Object to the site, it is in flood zone and any new buildings would not be in character with the village.	
540	Land off Daphne Road	Housing	Orford	Private individual	Object to the development in terms of flood risk, loss of amenity, increase traffic and access across a registered village green	Comment noted. Site not proposed for allocation reflecting vehicle access.
540	Land off Daphne Road	Housing	Orford	Suffolk Wildlife	Site is in close proximity to the Alde-Ore Estuary SPA,	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
				Trust	Alde-Ore and Butley Estuaries SAC, Alde-Ore Estuary Ramsar site and the Alde-Ore Estuary SSSI. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	
98	Land north of the Depot, Church Road	Housing	Otley	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – However, it was deemed Sites 465 and 764 (site allocations: SCLP12.54 and SCLP12.55) are more suitable for allocation as site has potential access issues.
98	Land north of the Depot, Church Road	Housing	Otley	Otley Parish Council	In principal the site could have small development potential, although the Parish Council would strongly object to any development beyond the	Comments and infrastructure issues reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					physical limits boundary.	
98	Land north of the Depot, Church Road	Housing	Otley	Private individual	Site on the map does not reflect the actual boundaries. Site is important for wildlife. Site will require remediation due to former timber yard operations and outside of the village envelope.	
370	Land rear of St. Mary's Church, Church Road, Otley	Area to be Protected from Development	Otley	Otley Parish Council	Site is part of setting and back drop of the church, would be inappropriate to allow development of any nature, but support a section of the site to be used for additional burial ground.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
457	Land South of Church Farm House, Church Road, Otley	Housing	Otley	Otley Parish Council	Site is part of the setting of the church and inappropriate for development.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related
457	Land South of Church Farm House, Church Road, Otley	Housing	Otley	Landowner	Site promoted for residential use which would enhance to local facilities and support local shops,	Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					schools and road structure.	to the form of the settlement.
465	Land Bounded by Helmingham Road & Ipswich Road, Otley	Housing	Otley	Otley Parish Council	Site is out of the physical limit boundary. The loss of visual amenity would be detrimental to the character of Otley. There is no footpath. An unrealistic suggestion of 20 houses for this plot.	The comments have been considered in identifying preferred sites. Otley is identified as a large village in the settlement hierarchy and has potential for some growth. The policy directs development to the southern part of the site and requires retention of hedgerows and trees where possible.
764	Land at Chapel Road	Housing and Open space	Otley	Otley Parish Council	Land is inappropriate. It is outside the physical limits boundary. Such development would extend into the countryside; the countryside must avoid encroachment and therefore remain undeveloped. A large estate type development would be inconsistent with the scale and character of Otley.	The comments have been considered in identifying preferred sites. Otley is identified as a large village in the settlement hierarchy and has potential for some growth. The policy requires landscaping to provide a 'soft' edge in relation to the edge of the settlement. The policy also requires
764	Land at Chapel	Housing and Open space	Otley	Landbridge	Site promoted by	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road				landowner for residential use.	pedestrian connections to the existing footpath on the south of Chapel Road.
764	Land at Chapel Road	Housing and Open space	Otley	SCC Highways	Footway along frontage and linking to existing footway on Chapel Road required	
771	Land adjacent to Swiss Cottage Farm	Housing	Otley	Otley Parish Council	Land is unsuitable, development of this scale is disproportionate to the size of Otley and would damage natural character of the village. Site is also outside of the physical limits boundary.	Comments and complexities of allocating only part of the site reflected in it not being proposed for allocation in the Draft Plan.
771	Land adjacent to Swiss Cottage Farm	Housing	Otley	SCC Highways	Direct access onto Chapel road required.	
772	Land North of Swiss Cottage Farm	Housing	Otley	Otley Parish Council	Land is unsuitable, development of this scale is disproportionate to the size of Otley and would damage natural character of the village. Site is also outside of the physical limits boundary.	Comments concerning the scale of development reflected in it not being proposed for allocation in the Draft Plan.
772	Land North of Swiss Cottage Farm	Housing	Otley	Landbridge	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	
772	Land North of Swiss Cottage	Housing	Otley	SCC Highways	Improvements to local junctions and ped crossing	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Farm				facilities to accommodate this level of development.	
1001	Land north of Otley House, Helmingham Road, Otley	Housing	Otley	Otley Parish Council	Site is out of the physical limit boundary. There is no footpath. An unrealistic suggestion of 9 houses for this plot. It is currently a wooded area providing environmental benefits to the village and wildlife.	Comments reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for development.
1036	Land rear of St. Mary's Church, Church Road, Otley	Housing	Otley	Otley Parish Council	Site is part of setting and back drop of the church, would be inappropriate to allow development of any nature,	The site is not made available for consideration for development in this local plan.
1036	Land rear of St. Mary's Church, Church Road, Otley	Housing	Otley	SCC Highways	Appears to require adjacent sites to link to Church Road	
1051	Land at Wood Farm, Helmingham Road, Otley	Housing	Otley	Otley Parish Council	Parish Council is against development on this site, outside of the physical limits boundary and no footpath.	The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic
1051	Land at Wood	Housing	Otley	Private	Site would require footpath	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Farm, Helmingham Road, Otley			individual	linking development to the Ipswich Road junction. Otley requires units for people wanting to downsize or affordable starter homes. Believe that 10-12 houses would be enough on this site.	Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
55	Land opposite Willoughby Villa, Main Road	Housing	Parham	Parham Parish Council	Any future development within Parham needs to be proportionate to the scale of the village and comprise mix of open market value houses and affordable houses with design and character an important consideration.	The site is not available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
250	Land north of White House Farm	Housing	Parham	Parham Parish Council	Any future development within Parham needs to be proportionate to the scale of the village and comprise mix of open market value houses and affordable houses with design and character an important consideration.	The site is not available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
359	Land north of	Affordable Housing	Parham	Parham	Any future development	The site is not available

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Park Farm Cottages			Parish Council	within Parham needs to be proportionate to the scale of the village and comprise mix of open market value houses and affordable houses with design and character an important consideration.	for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
360	Land south and east of Green Farm Cottage, North Green	Affordable Housing	Parham	Parham Parish Council	Any future development within Parham needs to be proportionate to the scale of the village and comprise mix of open market value houses and affordable houses with design and character an important consideration.	The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
2	Adjacent to Primary School, Hackney Road	Housing	Peasenhall	Peasenhall Parish Council	Site forms part of centre for recreation, leisure and sporting activities in the village and cannot be lost to development.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
2	Adjacent to Primary School, Hackney Road	Housing	Peasenhall	Private individual	A development on the west of the site in conjunction with the school might be viable. Development to the east could be enhanced	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					near the village hall to provide much needed amenities in the village.	
2	Adjacent to Primary School, Hackney Road	Housing	Peasenhall	Private individual	Around the village hall, the vehicular access to this land is already very dangerous & the village generally enjoys access to this whole area.	
37	Land adjacent Bridge Cottages, The Causeway	Housing	Peasenhall	Private individual	Site on the causeway seems like a good way of tidying-up the centre of the village to us, especially if the adjacent listed property is restored at the same time & the red phone box is retained in a new position by the planned bridge.	
37	Land adjacent Bridge Cottages, The Causeway	Housing	Peasenhall	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Great crested newts are known at the site, further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on great crested newts.	
37	Land adjacent Bridge Cottages, The Causeway	Housing	Peasenhall	Private individual	Site is designated allotments and is artificially empty.	
37	Land adjacent	Housing	Peasenhall	Peasenhall	This site is currently the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Bridge Cottages, The Causeway			Parish Council	subject of a planning application. It has a centre village location and part of the proposal is a package of community benefit in the form of a play area and allotments. The Parish Council continues to support the inclusion of this site in the plan.	
71	Land adjacent to The Glen, Bruisyard Road	Housing	Peasenhall	Landowner	Land is under our ownership and not available for development.	The site is not made available for consideration for development in the Draft Local Plan.
71	Land adjacent to The Glen, Bruisyard Road	Housing	Peasenhall	Private individual	It has poor access because of the nature of Bruisyard Road or having to cross the stream to Hackney Road.	
71	Land adjacent to The Glen, Bruisyard Road	Housing	Peasenhall	Peasenhall Parish Council	The Parish Council supports the inclusion of this site for possible future development but only on the basis that it forms a much larger allocation to include the field to the west	
312	Land at The Club, Pouy Street	Land at The Club, Pouy Street	Peasenhall	Peasenhall Parish Council	The Parish Council supports the inclusion of this small site with potential for 2 or 3	The site is too small to allocate in the Draft Local Plan.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					dwelling	
380	land east of Newlands, Mill Road	Housing	Peasehall	Peasehall Parish Council	The Parish does not support inclusion of this site. Development in this area would be accessed onto the existing rural road network which is narrow with dangerous junctions, particularly that at Emmetts Corner. Any development would increase traffic creating a worsening problem for road users.	Comments and highways issues reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for development in the Draft Local Plan.
718	Land adjoining Russell Close, Badingham road, Peasehall	Housing	Peasehall	Peasehall Parish Council	The Parish Council does not support inclusion of this site for possible future development. The existing Russell Close development was considered as an exemption site due to its social housing element. This proposal is further outside of the village envelope and will extend development into the open countryside to the west and south.	Comments reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for development in the Draft Local Plan.
718	Land adjoining Russell Close, Badingham road,	Housing	Peasehall	Private individual	Site likely to be used for affordable housing, site in agricultural use at edge of	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Peasenhall				village.	
719	Land at Low Farm Bungalow, Peasenhall, IP17 2JN	Housing	Peasenhall	Peasenhall Parish Council	The Parish Council does not support inclusion of this site for future development. It is on the very edge of and unrelated to the core of the village and development of the site would be an unwelcome encroachment into the open countryside at this location.	Comments noted. The site is not proposed for allocation reflecting flood risk and environmental impacts.
719	Land at Low Farm Bungalow, Peasenhall, IP17 2JN	Housing	Peasenhall	Private individual	Edge of the village in conservation area	
778	Land East of Mill Rise	Housing	Peasenhall	Peasenhall Parish Council	The Parish does not support inclusion of this site. Development in this area would be accessed onto the existing rural road network which is narrow with dangerous junctions, particularly that at Emmetts Corner. Any development would increase traffic creating a worsening problem for road users.	Comments reflected in the small site not being proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan.
778	Land East of Mill Rise	Housing	Peasenhall	Private individual	Land forming amenity land to Old Vicarage	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
779	Land West of Mill Rise	Housing	Peasenhall	Peasenhall Parish Council	The Parish does not support inclusion of this site. Development in this area would be accessed onto the existing rural road network which is narrow with dangerous junctions, particularly that at Emmetts Corner. Any development would increase traffic creating a worsening problem for road users.	Comments reflected in the small site not being proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan.
779	Land West of Mill Rise	Housing	Peasenhall	Private individual	Woodland area part of village landscape	
988	Land opposite 1-9 Oak View, Mill Hill, Peasenhall	Housing	Peasenhall	Peasenhall Parish Council	In the previous plan consultations the development of this site was supported and it was included within the physical limits boundary. The Parish Council continues to support the inclusion of this site but would wish to see the potential number of dwellings reduced.	Site not proposed for allocation for highways reasons.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
1042	Land at Sibton Road opposite Peasenhall & Sibton Methodist Church	Housing	Peasenhall	Peasenhall Parish Council	The Parish Council are not in favour of development of this site. Only a small part of the site is included within the physical limits boundary. Part of the site has the potential to flood according to the Environment Agency that would restrict any large scale development proposals. The site provides an important open aspect entrance to the village.	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation for development in the Draft Local Plan reflecting landscape evidence.
1042	Land at Sibton Road opposite Peasenhall & Sibton Methodist Church	Housing	Peasenhall	Private individual	Site suitable for old peoples homes or bungalows.	
1042	Land at Sibton Road opposite Peasenhall & Sibton Methodist Church	Housing	Peasenhall	Private individual	Site was rejected on last call for sites and nothing has changed. Peasenhall is not a Key Service Centre and building of this scale would only add to the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					environmental impact of residents. Development on this site would alter the charm and aesthetic appearance of the village.	
73	Land adjacent to Three Tuns PH, The Street	Housing	Pettistree	Peter Wells Architects	Land promoted by landowner for residential use.	The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
1121	Land between High Street and Chapel Lane (Wickham Market)	Housing	Pettistree	Wickham Market Parish Council	Site is a prime site for development	Site has been identified as a preferred site for allocation.
870	Land at Kiln Farm, Main Road	Housing	Playford	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
870	Land at Kiln Farm, Main Road	Housing	Playford	Private individual	Not sustainable location	Comments noted however site is not available for
870	Land at Kiln	Housing	Playford	Turnberry	Concerned that further	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Farm, Main Road			Planning Ltd	development of this site will risk creating urban sprawl between Rushmere St Andrew and Kesgrave.	consideration in the Local Plan.
870	Land at Kiln Farm, Main Road	Housing	Playford	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Potential massive development which would have a detrimental impact on traffic and would lose the village outlook	
870	Land at Kiln Farm, Main Road	Housing	Playford	SCC Highways	Some narrow country lands would require improvement or realignment. Scheme has the ability to deliver long distance sustainable links from Kesgrave to the edge of Ipswich and these would need to be secured as part of a wider review of links to Ipswich.	
146	Land at and surrounding Purdis Rise, Purdis Farm Lane	Housing	Purdis Farm	Greenways Project	Further development in this area would have an adverse impact on SSSI.	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
146	Land at and surrounding Purdis Rise, Purdis Farm	Housing	Purdis Farm	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to part of the Ipswich Heaths SSSI and Ipswich Golf Course CWS. Further assessment is	Site not made available for consideration in the Local Plan strategy.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Lane				required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	
146	Land at and surrounding Purdis Rise, Purdis Farm Lane	Housing	Purdis Farm	SCC Highways	Significant footway improvements to Bucklesham Road and Purdis Farm Lane required. Latter is private.	
195	Purdis Croft, Bucklesham Road	Housing	Purdis Farm	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to part of the Ipswich Heaths SSSI. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	Comment and Local Plan spatial strategy reflected in the site not being allocated.
451	Land to the North and East of Redwald Road Rendlesham	Housing Care Home Open Space	Rendlesham	Richard Brown Planning Limited	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Comments noted. Part of the site is one of sites previously allocated in Rendlesham in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD are carried forward to meet the Local Plan strategy for housing growth.
451	Land to the North and East of Redwald Road Rendlesham	Housing Care Home Open Space	Rendlesham	SCC Highways	Footway links into Rendlesham required. May impact upon Melton crossroads without mitigation or improvement to junction	
482	Old usaf site	Any	Rendlesham	David	Site is definitely brown field	Comment noted. Sites

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	opposite tower field road			Houchell Ltd	site and suitable for various types of development.	previously allocated in Rendlesham in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document are carried forward to meet the Local Plan strategy for housing growth.
506	Land to the rear of 3 - 33 Suffolk Drive, Rendlesham	Housing	Rendlesham	SCC Highways	Adjacent to private road. Consider access links to site from A1152	Comment noted. Sites previously allocated in Rendlesham in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document are carried forward to meet the Local Plan strategy for housing growth.
506	Land to the rear of 3 - 33 Suffolk Drive	Housing	Rendlesham	Trustees of Bunbury	Land promoted for development	Site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however the Local Plan does not allocate additional sites in Rendlesham.
698	Bentwaters Park,	Housing	Rendlesham	RSPB	Development in this area	The site has been

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Rendlesham, IP12 2TW				could result in increased recreational disturbance to the nearby Sandlings SPA. Any proposed allocation must undergo HRA to consider the potential impacts of new development close to this site and ensure that it is not adversely affected	identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
698	Bentwaters Park, Rendlesham, IP12 2TW	Housing	Rendlesham	SCC Highways	Bentwaters Park currently has limited traffic generation in accordance with conditions 3 & 4 of planning permission C/10/3239	
699	Bentwaters Park	Housing /Holiday Lets	Rendlesham	Bentwaters Parks Ltd	Site also put forward for housing, in addition to holiday lets previously submitted.	Site noted as being available for holiday lets and housing. Site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
699	Bentwaters Park, Rendlesham, IP12 2TW	Holiday lets	Rendlesham	RSPB	Development in this area could result in increased recreational disturbance to the nearby Sandlings SPA. Any proposed allocation must undergo HRA to	The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					consider the potential impacts of new development close to this site and ensure that it is not adversely affected	Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
699	Bentwaters Park, Rendlesham, IP12 2TW	Holiday lets	Rendlesham	SCC Highways	Development in Rendlesham will impact on the Woods Lane cross roads in Melton which is already at capacity. However, depending on the site arrangements the main impacts of holiday uses may not have the same peak impacts as a similar sized residential use. However annual, monthly and daily traffic flow limits have been set for this area which are already close to being met by the baseline traffic. Therefore any significant development would have to demonstrate that these thresholds would not be exceeded.	
88	Land at 868A and 876 Foxhall Road	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Ipswich Golf Course CWS and the Mount CWS. Further	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation due to

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	unsuitable highways access.
88	Land at 868A and 876 Foxhall Road	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Natural extension of Brookhill Park – acceptable providing no direct access onto Foxhall Road at the bend/hill top. Alternative access may be further along Foxhall Road.	
88	Land at 868A and 876 Foxhall Road	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Private individual	Site promoted for residential use.	
88	Land at 868A and 876 Foxhall Road	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	SCC Highways	Unlikely that adequate visibility achievable due to bends in road	
182	Land off Tuddenham Lane, Adjacent to Millbank House	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Unsustainable – poor infrastructure (Lamberts Lane) – single track and separate from the main village.	Site not made available for consideration in the Local Plan.
332	Land at and south of 4 Playford Road	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Already has planning permission	Comment noted. Small site not proposed for allocation.
353	Land at	Housing	Rushmere St	Rushmere	As owners of site 353 we	Site not available for

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Rushmere St Andrew Sports Club		Andrew	St Andrew Parish Council	have no intention to develop the site and wish to retain it as a sporting facility currently under the tenure of the Ipswich School Sports Centre. It has already been partly developed at Eaton Place (as an enabling development to finance refurbishment of the site facilities).	consideration in the Local Plan.
353	Land at Rushmere St aAndrew Sports Club	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
353	Land at Rushmere St aAndrew Sports Club	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	SCC Highways	No foot ways on The Street – required.	Site not available for consideration in the Local Plan.
474	Land adjacent to Bixely Drive	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Potentially acceptable site.	Site not proposed for allocation reflecting deliverability uncertainties and the spatial strategy for the distribution of new housing across the District. The site is

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						withn the settlement boundary and in principle could therefore come forward under Policy SCLP3.4.
953	Land between Playford Road and Bent Lane, opposite sports fields	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	London and Merchant Properties	Land promoted for development.	Comments noted. Land not identified as a preferred site due to potential loss of playing fields and the strategy of the Local Plan does not focus growth in the east of Ipswich.
953	Land between Playford Road and Bent Lane, opposite sports fields	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	
953	Land between Playford road and Bent Lane, opposite sports fields	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Must be retained as sporting facilities for the community.	Comments around sports facilities and highways reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for housing development in the Draft Local Plan.
953	Land between Playford road and Bent Lane, opposite sports fields	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	SCC Highways	Footway improvement required on Playford Road and potentially also Bent Lane.	
994	Land to north of Playford Lane,	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Rushmere St Andrew					Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – significant constraints regarding access.
994	Land to north of Playford Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Site is outside the PLB and access along Playford Lane would be unrealistic.	Comments noted, site identified as unsuitable due to significant access constraints.
994	Land to north of Playford Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Sites represent a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Development in this area could also conflict with the Ipswich 'Green Rim' being proposed by Ipswich Borough Council as part of their Local Plan, this could result in significant detrimental impacts on the potential availability of greenspace in and around the town.	
1060	Land at Ipswich Town Football Club training	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	ground, Playford Road, Rushmere St Andrew					Economic Land Availability Assessment
1060	Land at Ipswich Town Football Club training ground, Playford Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Playing fields	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Must be retained as sporting facilities for the community.	Site is not available for housing or employment uses.
1060	Land at Ipswich Town Football Club training ground, Playford Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Playing fields	Rushmere St Andrew	SCC Highways	Playford Road footway would require widening. Assess in conjunction with adjacent sites.	
1082	Land North of Humber Doucy Lane (open space), Rushmere St Andrew	Open Space / Playing Field	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	In isolation. It has extremely poor access.	
1082	Land North of Humber Doucy Lane (open space), Rushmere St Andrew	Land North of Humber Doucy Lane	Rushmere St Andrew	Kesgrave Covenant	Land promoted for development	Issues relating to access and existing provision of open space and green infrastructure.
1083	Land opposite 309-405 Humber	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Kesgrave Covenant	Land promoted for development	Site identified as potentially suitable in

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Doucy Lane,					Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however infrastructure constraints exist in relation to highways and education around this part of Ipswich and growth in this part of the District is not central to the Local Plan strategy. It was deemed sites elsewhere in the district were more suitable for allocation.
1083	Land opposite 309-405 Humber Doucy Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Sites represent a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Development in this area could also conflict with the Ipswich 'Green Rim' being proposed by Ipswich Borough Council as part of their Local Plan, this could result in significant detrimental impacts on the potential availability of	Comments noted. The site would need to be taken forward in conjunction with plans and strategies for adjoining land in Ipswich Borough. The strategy for the Local Plan does not focus growth around Ipswich.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					greenspace in and around the town	
1083	Land opposite 309-405 Humber Doucy Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	SCC Highways	Significant improvement to Tuddenham Lane required to accommodate traffic and ped use. Suitability of site may be influenced by Ipswich northern bypass. Assess in conjunction with adjacent sites.	
1084	Land off Rushmere Road and Humber Doucy Lane	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however infrastructure constraints exist in relation to highways and education around this part of Ipswich and growth in this part of the District is not central to the Local Plan strategy. It was deemed sites elsewhere in the district were more suitable for allocation.
1084	Land off Rushmere Road	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Greenways Project	Existing wildlife, primarily hedgerows, should be	Comments noted, however site not

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	and Humber Doucy Lane				protected. Enhancement through creation of new semi natural habitat.	proposed for development.
1084	Land off Rushmere Road and Humber Doucy Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Sites represent a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Development in this area could also conflict with the Ipswich 'Green Rim' being proposed by Ipswich Borough Council as part of their Local Plan, this could result in significant detrimental impacts on the potential availability of greenspace in and around the town	Comments noted. Site not preferred having regard to the emerging spatial strategy for housing growth and highways and sports provision constraints.
1084	Land off Rushmere Road and Humber Doucy Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Development of these sites would be contrary to SSP36 of the existing Local Plan.	
1084	Land off Rushmere Road and Humber Doucy Lane,	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	SCC Highways	Significant improvement to Humber Doucy Lane required to accommodate traffic and ped use.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Rushmere St Andrew				Suitability of site may be influenced by Ipswich northern bypass. Assess in conjunction with adjacent sites.	
1085	Humber Doucy Lane, adjacent to Wanderers football club, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however infrastructure constraints exist in relation to highways and education around this part of Ipswich and growth in this part of the District is not central to the Local Plan strategy. It was deemed sites elsewhere in the district were more suitable for allocation.
1085	Humber Doucy Lane, adjacent to Wanderers football club, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Greenways Project	Existing wildlife, primarily hedgerows, should be protected. Enhancement through creation of new semi natural habitat.	Comments noted, however site not proposed for development.
1085	Humber Doucy	Housing	Rushmere St	Suffolk	Sites represent a large block	Comments noted. Site

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Lane, adjacent to Wanderers football club, Rushmere St Andrew		Andrew	Wildlife Trust	of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Development in this area could also conflict with the Ipswich 'Green Rim' being proposed by Ipswich Borough Council as part of their Local Plan, this could result in significant detrimental impacts on the potential availability of greenspace in and around the town	not preferred having regard to the emerging spatial strategy for housing growth and highways and sports provision constraints.
1085	Humber Doucy Lane, adjacent to Wanderers football club, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Must be retained as sporting facilities for the community. Development of these sites would be contrary to SSP36 of the existing Local Plan.	
1085	Humber Doucy Lane, adjacent to Wanderers football club, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	SCC Highways	Significant improvement to Humber Doucy Lane required to accommodate traffic and ped use. Suitability of site may be influenced by Ipswich northern bypass. Assess in conjunction with adjacent	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					sites.	
1087	Land at and surrounding Hill Farm, Lamberts Lane	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Bloor Homes	Land promoted for development.	Strategic scale site that does not fit with the emerging spatial strategy of this Local Plan. Would require a strategic approach with infrastructure providers and Ipswich Borough not least in terms of highways. Natural environment interests reflected in the Draft SHELAA.
1087	Land at and surrounding Hill Farm, Lamberts Lane	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council	Would add to lack of separation between Ipswich and villages and have a negative impact on highways and education.	
1087	Land at and surrounding Hill Farm, Lamberts Lane	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Greenways Project	Not suitable for large scale development but could provide opportunities for creation of 'green rim'. Wildlife value in southern section should be protected. Creation of semi natural green space.	
1087	Land at and surrounding Hill Farm, Lamberts Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Sites represent a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Development in this area could also conflict with the Ipswich 'Green Rim' being proposed by Ipswich Borough Council as part of their Local Plan, this could	Strategic scale site that does not fit with the emerging spatial strategy of this Local Plan. Would require a strategic approach with infrastructure providers and Ipswich Borough not least in terms of highways. Natural environment interests

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					result in significant detrimental impacts on the potential availability of greenspace in and around the town	reflected in the Draft SHELAA.
1087	Land at and surrounding Hill Farm, Lamberts Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Unsustainable development, would be a massive extension to the village and require massive infrastructure uplift with no links to existing feeder roads.	Strategic scale site that does not fit with the emerging spatial strategy of this Local Plan. Would require a strategic approach with infrastructure providers and Ipswich Borough not least in terms of highways. Natural environment interests reflected in the Draft SHELAA.
1087	Land at and surrounding Hill Farm, Lamberts Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Woodbridge Town Council	Site would lead to massive encroachment of greater Ipswich and there is too much development in the Eastern corridor as it is; we certainly would not wish to see this continue.	Strategic scale site that does not fit with the emerging spatial strategy of this Local Plan. Would require a strategic approach with infrastructure providers and Ipswich Borough not least in terms of highways. Natural environment interests

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						reflected in the Draft SHELAA.
1087	Land at and surrounding Hill Farm, Lamberts Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Strutt & Parker LLP	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Strategic scale site that does not fit with the emerging spatial strategy of this Local Plan. Would require a strategic approach with infrastructure providers and Ipswich Borough not least in terms of highways. Natural environment interests reflected in the Draft SHELAA.
1087	Land at and surrounding Hill Farm, Lamberts Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	SCC Highways	Lamberts Lane is a very narrow country lane that would require considerable widening to make it suitable for any increase in traffic. Holly Lane is also not suitable. Humber Doucy Lane would also require improvement along the whole length and the junctions with Tuddenham Road and Rushmere Road would need improvement. Multiple points of access	Strategic scale site that does not fit with the emerging spatial strategy of this Local Plan. Would require a strategic approach with infrastructure providers and Ipswich Borough not least in terms of highways. Natural environment interests reflected in the Draft SHELAA.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					would be required which would be difficult to achieve given the site is bordered by the railway line to the north.	
1089	Land off Rushmere Road and Humber Doucy Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Private individual	Exclude this site from development	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – However, it was deemed sites elsewhere in the district were more suitable for allocation. Natural environment interests reflected in the Draft SHELAA.
1089	Land off Rushmere Road and Humber Doucy Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Greenways Project	Existing wildlife, primarily hedgerows, should be protected. Enhancement through creation of new semi natural habitat.	Comments noted, however site not proposed for development. Natural environment interests reflected in the Draft SHELAA.
1089	Land off Rushmere Road and Humber Doucy Lane, Rushmere St	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Sites represent a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest.	Comments noted. Site not preferred in relation to the emerging spatial strategy for housing growth. Natural

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Andrew				Development in this area could also conflict with the Ipswich 'Green Rim' being proposed by Ipswich Borough Council as part of their Local Plan, this could result in significant detrimental impacts on the potential availability of greenspace in and around the town	environment interests reflected in the Draft SHELAA.
1089	Land off Rushmere Road and Humber Doucy Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Housing	Rushmere St Andrew	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Development of these sites would be contrary to SSP36 of the existing Local Plan.	
33	Land adjacent to Fromus House, Street Farm Road	Car park	Saxmundham	Saxmundham Town Council	We would in principle support possible public car parking use.	Comment noted. However, the site is not available for development.
123	Land at Carlton Gate, Brook Farm Road	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	I consider the reasons stated by the local planning authority for requiring this designation in the current local plan remain true and relevant today and thus I consider this protected status designation should	Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					be carried forward in to the new local plan	
435	Land north and east of The Manor House, Church Hill	Housing	Saxmundham	Hopkins Homes	Unsustainable location due to distance from town centre, open landscape character and narrow road frontage.	Site not proposed for allocation as not of sufficient scale to accommodate strategic scale of growth.
435	Land north and east of The Manor House, Church Hill	Housing	Saxmundham	Private Individual	Clarification that only southern part of site is available. Land promoted for development.	Site has been amended to exclude the northern part. Site has been considered as part of assessment of options for Saxmundham, however it is concluded that development to the south of Saxmundham would enable a comprehensive approach to be taken on one site.
435	land north and east of The Manor House, Church Hill	Housing	Saxmundham	EDF Energy	Potential for infrastructure improvements to be required to the railway in this area. EDF requests that account is taken of the potential need for improvement works to the rail line in this area.	Comments noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the Town are more suitable for allocation, considering the infrastructure issues. Additionally, the site allocation SCLP12.26 to
435	land north and	Housing	Saxmundham	SCC	Potential impact upon	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	east of The Manor House, Church Hill			Highways	Church Street signalised junction. Detailed analysis and potential mitigation required	the South of Saxmundham is expected to bring forward significant infrastructure improvements.
436	land north of The Manor House, Church Hill	Housing	Saxmundham	EDF Energy	Potential for infrastructure improvements to be required to the railway in this area. EDF requests that account is taken of the potential need for improvement works to the rail line in this area.	Comments noted. The site is an existing site allocation carried forward into the First Draft Local Plan. Infrastructure improvements will be sought where possible.
436	land north of The Manor House, Church Hill	Housing	Saxmundham	SCC Highways	Improvements to Street farm Rd required	The site allocation SCLP12.26 to the South of Saxmundham is expected to bring forward significant infrastructure improvements.
559	Land at The Manor House, Church Hill	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Hopkins Homes	This is the only suitable site to the east of Saxmundham however it would not deliver the scale of growth required.	Site not proposed for allocation as not of sufficient scale to accommodate strategic scale of growth.
559	Land at The Manor House, Church Hill	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Private Individual	Land promoted for development.	Site identified as potentially suitable in the Draft Strategic

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however land to the south of Saxmundham has been identified for development of a new Garden Neighbourhood.
559	Land at The Manor House, Church Hill	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	SCC Highways	Potential impact upon Church Street signalised junction. Detailed analysis and potential mitigation required	Comment noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the Parish are more suitable for allocation, considering the infrastructure issues.
568	Land adjacent and North of Keats Close, Saxmundham, IP17 2BH	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Open space next to popular dog walk between Saxmundham and Carlton. Currently no access and any new access would be dangerous.	Comment noted. The site is not a potential site due to significant constraints regarding access.
714	Land south of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Hopkins Homes	Development of the site would have a landscape impact and may not be able to deliver access improvements.	Comments received have been considered in identifying preferred sites. Strategic development at Saxmundham is a

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						<p>fundamental part of the Local Plan strategy and enables the delivery of infrastructure notably a primary school. The area would be developed based on the principles of a Garden Neighbourhood. Policy SCLP12.26 includes a requirement for biodiversity networks to be preserved and enhanced. A key consideration has been ensuring that the gap between Saxmundham and Benhall is retained, and the southern boundary of the site will be defined after the consultation on the Frist Draft Local Plan. The selected site area also seeks to preserve The Layers area. Highways comments are being considered through the highways modelling with</p>

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						Suffolk County Council.
714	Land south of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Historic England	Development to the south of Saxmundham would alter the character of the town and the distinction between town and countryside, and impact on views out of the Conservation Area.	The area to the south of Saxmundham is identified as a location for strategic scale growth, and maintenance of the gap between Saxmundham and Benhall is a key part of the policy approach. The area identified also considers minimising impacts on Hurts Hall to the east. The masterplanning process will provide an opportunity to consider the historic environment further.
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Pigeon Investment Management Ltd	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	Comments received have been considered in identifying preferred sites. Strategic development at Saxmundham is a fundamental part of the Local Plan strategy and enables the delivery of infrastructure notably a
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Private individual	Development proposals in this location are ill considered and represent poor future development. Priority should be given to brown field sites,	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					contaminated land, redundant areas and buildings. Concerned about environmental impact of the proposed development, increased light pollution, noise pollution and impact on wildlife.	primary school. The area would be developed based on the principles of a Garden Neighbourhood. Policy SCLP12.26 includes a requirement for biodiversity networks to be preserved and enhanced. A key consideration has been ensuring that the gap between Saxmundham and Benhall is retained, and the southern boundary of the site will be defined after the consultation on the First Draft Local Plan. The selected site area also seeks to preserve The Layers area. Highways comments are being considered through the highways modelling with Suffolk County Council.
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Represent a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Private individual	Concerned that Benhall Green and Sternfield should remain distinct communities and not be swallowed up in a greater Saxmundham. Any development will be detrimental to the character of the village with	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					very limited facilities.	
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Behall & Sternfield Parish Council	Oppose. Any development of these sites would intrude into the open country side between Benhall and Saxmundham, and contribute to the loss of village identity.	
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Private individual	Some building here may be inevitable but please leave some countryside between Sax' and Benhall Green	
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Private individual	Inappropriate as unsuitable ribbon developments and link up Saxmundham with existing settlement of Benhall.	
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Private individual	Development would totally destroy the identity of Benhall. Implications for the infrastructure in the area would be catastrophic and the Layers would be gone forever. Benhall has already been imposed a disproportional large number of housing permissions and further sites should be rejected.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Private individual	Building between towns and villages should be avoided at all costs. A village loses it's character once part of something bigger	
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	Private individual	Saxmundham has had a huge amount of new housing. Suggested development would lead to ribbon development connecting Saxmundham and Benhall Green.	
714	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing and open space	Saxmundham	SCC Highways	All sites should co-operate to ensure a masterplan for the area to the south of Saxmundham. Access for this site likely to be a separate junction on the A12, also serving the employment land west of the A12. No viable vehicular links to Saxmundham, although walking and cycling links will need to be provided. Any east bound traffic will impact on the capacity constrained Chantry Road (B1121 /	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					B1119) signal crossroads in the centre of Saxmundham.	
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Hopkins Homes	Development on the south of the site could potentially have significant adverse landscape impacts.	Comments received have been considered in identifying preferred sites. Strategic development at Saxmundham is a fundamental part of the Local Plan strategy and enables the delivery of infrastructure notably a primary school. The area would be developed based on the principles of a Garden Neighbourhood. Policy SCLP12.26 includes a requirement for biodiversity networks to be preserved and enhanced. A key consideration has been ensuring that the gap between Saxmundham and Benhall is retained, and the southern boundary of the site will be defined after the

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						consultation on the Frist Draft Local Plan. The selected site area also seeks to preserve The Layers area. Highways comments are being considered through the highways modelling with Suffolk County Council.
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Historic England	Development to the south of Saxmundham would alter the character of the town and the distinction between town and countryside, and impact on views out of the Conservation Area.	The area to the south of Saxmundham is identified as a location for strategic scale growth, and maintenance of the gap between Saxmundham and Benhall is a key part of the policy approach. The area identified also considers minimising impacts on Hurts Hall to the east. The masterplanning process will provide an opportunity to consider the historic environment further.
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Pigeon Investment	Site promoted by landowner for residential	Comments received have been considered in

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
				Management Ltd	use.	identifying preferred sites. Strategic
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Development proposals in this location are ill considered and represent poor future development. Priority should be given to brown field sites, contaminated land, redundant areas and buildings. Concerned about environmental impact of the proposed development, increased light pollution, noise pollution and impact on wildlife.	development at Saxmundham is a fundamental part of the Local Plan strategy and enables the delivery of infrastructure notably a primary school. The area would be developed based on the principles of a Garden Neighbourhood. Policy SCLP12.26 includes a requirement for biodiversity networks to be preserved and enhanced. A key consideration has been ensuring that the gap between Saxmundham and Benhall is retained, and the southern boundary of the site will be defined after the consultation on the First Draft Local Plan. The selected site area also seeks to preserve The
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Represent a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
717	Land South of	Housing	Saxmundham	Private	Concerned that Benhall	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Saxmundham			individual	Green and Sternfield should remain distinct communities and not be swallowed up in a greater Saxmundham. Any development will be detrimental to the character of the village with very limited facilities.	Layers area. Highways comments are being considered through the highways modelling with Suffolk County Council.
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Behall & Sternfield Parish Council	Oppose. Any development of these sites would intrude into the open country side between Benhall and Saxmundham, and contribute to the loss of village identity.	
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Some building here may be inevitable but please leave some countryside between Sax' and Benhall Green	
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Inappropriate as unsuitable ribbon developments and link up Saxmundham with existing settlement of Benhall.	
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Development would totally destroy the identity of Benhall. Implications for the infrastructure in the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					area would be catastrophic and the Layers would be gone forever. Benhall has already been imposed a disproportional large number of housing permissions and further sites should be rejected.	
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Building between towns and villages should be avoided at all costs. A village loses it's character once part of something bigger	
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Saxmundham has had a huge amount of new housing. Suggested development would lead to ribbon development connecting Saxmundham and Benhall Green.	
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Saxmundham Town Council	The layers land and south of Saxmundham – see comments on ribbon development.	
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Oppose development which would result in loss of Benhall's character as a village community. Building	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					on both sides of the main route between Benhall and Saxmundham would generate unacceptable amount of extra traffic.	
717	Land South of Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	SCC Highways	Links to east and north of site required. Potential impact upon Church Street signalised junction. Detailed analysis and potential mitigation required	
830	Land at Saxmundham Station, Station Approach	Housing	Saxmundham	Saxmundham Town Council	These central sites adjacent to the Station should not be earmarked for housing, but for parking, employment or commercial uses (to be determined)	Comment noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites the site is below the 0.2ha site size threshold.
1012	Land West of Hurtshall Park	Housing	Saxmundham	Historic England	Development to the south of Saxmundham would alter the character of the town and the distinction between town and countryside, and impact on views out of the Conservation Area.	The area to the south of Saxmundham is identified as a location for strategic scale growth, and maintenance of the gap between Saxmundham and Benhall is a key part of the policy approach. The area identified also

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						considers minimising impacts on Hurts Hall to the east. The masterplanning process will provide an opportunity to consider the historic environment further.
1012	Land West of Hurts Hall Park, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Development proposals in this location are ill considered and represent poor future development. Priority should be given to brown field sites, contaminated land, redundant areas and buildings. Concerned about environmental impact of the proposed development, increased light pollution, noise pollution and impact on wildlife.	Comments received have been considered in identifying preferred sites. Strategic development at Saxmundham is a fundamental part of the Local Plan strategy and enables the delivery of infrastructure notably a primary school. The area would be developed based on the principles of a Garden
1012	Land West of Hurts Hall Park, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Represent a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is	Neighbourhood. Policy SCLP12.26 includes a requirement for biodiversity networks to be preserved and enhanced. A key

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	consideration has been ensuring that the gap between Saxmundham and Benhall is retained, and the southern boundary of the site will be defined after the consultation on the Frist Draft Local Plan. The selected site area also seeks to preserve The Layers area. Highways comments are being considered through the highways modelling with Suffolk County Council.
1012	Land West of Hurts Hall Park, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Some building here may be inevitable but please leave some countryside between Sax' and Benhall Green	
1012	Land West of Hurts Hall Park, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Inappropriate as unsuitable ribbon developments and link up Saxmundham with existing settlement of Benhall.	
1012	Land West of Hurts Hall Park, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Development would totally destroy the identity of Benhall. Implications for the infrastructure in the area would be catastrophic and the Layers would be gone forever. Benhall has already been imposed a disproportional large number of housing permissions and further sites should be rejected.	
1012	Land West of Hurts Hall Park,	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Building between towns and villages should be	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Saxmundham				avoided at all costs. A village loses it's character once part of something bigger	
1012	Land West of Hurts Hall Park, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Saxmundham has had a huge amount of new housing. Suggested development would lead to ribbon development connecting Saxmundham and Benhall Green.	
1012	Land West of Hurts Hall Park, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Armstrong Rigg Limited	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	
1012	Land West of Hurts Hall Park, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	SCC Highways	Linked to adjacent site 714, site requires master planning with adjacent sites. If brought forward in isolation with access from south Entrance it is likely to generate north bound traffic which would impact on Chantry Road signal cross roads with is a capacity constraint.	
1062	Land adjacent to Grafo Products LTD Works, St Johns Road	Housing	Saxmundham	Saxmundham Town Council	These central sites adjacent to the Station should not be earmarked for housing, but for parking, employment or	Comment noted. The site is not a preferred site as sites elsewhere in the Town are more

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					commercial uses (to be determined)	suitable for allocation. The Council supports the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for delivering allocations for development centred on the needs of the community.
1080	land north of Tollgate Cottage, North Entrance, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Saxmundham Town Council	We had earlier favoured this site for a much-needed enhanced community health service facility. We continue to oppose use of this site for housing purposes, and wish to consult our community on options for future community-related facilities or use	Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
1080	land north of Tollgate Cottage, North Entrance, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Site 1080 was originally supposed to be for the provision of a new health centre for Saxmundham. It has already been turned down for housing and so should not be re-submitted. Saxmundham needs greater health provision and a space in which to provide it.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
1080	land north of Tollgate Cottage, North Entrance, Saxmundham	Housing	Saxmundham	Private individual	Site 1080 - This site is not appropriate for residential development. The site lies outside the development boundary of Saxmundham. An application for outline permission for residential development was recently refused by the District council and an appeal to the SofS dismissed following a public inquiry. For all the reasons stated in the Inspectors decision letter, I consider this site is not suitable for development at the present time.	
20	Land adjacent to 1-6 The Street	Housing	Shottisham	Shottisham WI	Site is within the flood plain and been subject to fluvial flooding in the past. Development here would have a negative impact on the historic patchwork of water meadows in Shottisham.	The site is not required because a site allocated in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document is carried forward into this Local Plan strategy for Shottisham. Shottisham is identified as within the countryside and the Local Plan does not look

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						to allocate sites in the countryside.
240	Land at Trust Hall, The Street	Housing	Shottisham	Shottisham WI	Site is owned by Shottisham WI and is not offered for development	The site is below the site size threshold of 0.2ha.
900	Land surrounding Trust Hall, The Street	Housing	Shottisham	Shottisham WI	Development on this site would be intrusive in the landscape and out of keeping with the adjacent conservation area.	The site is not made available for consideration in the Local Plan.
901	Land East of Heath Drive	Housing	Shottisham	Bawdsey Estate	Site is suitable, available and achievable.	Site has been considered through the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal process. Site identified as potentially suitable but not identified as a preferred site.
278	Land north of The Pump House, off A1120	Housing	Sibton	Private individual	Development would be on the edge of the village and very open to view. Site is next to Sewage Pumping Station.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
314	Land east of the White Horse Inn, Halesworth Road	Housing	Sibton	Private individual	On the edge of the village and very open to view Agricultural land	Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
545	Sizewell A Site,	Office/Storage/Industry	Sizewell	Suffolk	Site is part of Sizewell	Comments noted. Site

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Nr Leiston			Wildlife Trust	nuclear power station which is bordered to the west by Sizewell Marshes SSSI. The area is known to be of high wildlife value and therefore further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	identified as potentially suitable however it was deemed that sites elsewhere in the District would be more suitable for allocation to meet evidenced need.
545	Sizewell A Site, Nr Leiston	Office/Storage/Industry	Sizewell	SCC Highways	No comments. Traffic impact likely to be less than existing use.	
215	Land to the south of Priory Road	Housing	Snape	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Snape Marshes CWS. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement. Site is also not available for consideration in the Local Plan.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
519	Land off Church Road, Church Common	Housing	Snape	Snape Parish Council	The site should remain as common land.	Site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
519	Land off Church Road, Church Common	Housing	Snape	Private Individual	Land promoted for development.	Site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
519	Land off Church road, Church common, Snape	Housing	Snape	PlanSurv Ltd	Object to the scoring in the Sustainability Appraisal on behalf of the landowner.	The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
1013	Brick Kiln Park, Church Road	Housing	Snape	Snape Parish Council	Development of the site would raise traffic impacts	Site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
288	Land north and	Freight handling area	Stratton Hall	Private	Object to development due	Comments noted. Land

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	west of Walk Farm			Individual	to loss of open space and agricultural land, urban sprawl, impacts on tourism, traffic and pollution and infrastructure	further south of site (site 706) identified instead for employment land related to sustaining the future of the Port of Felixstowe.
288	Land north and west of Walk Farm	Freight handling area	Stratton Hall	Private Individual	Development would result in loss of farmland and creation of an industrial belt between Ipswich and Felixstowe	
288	Land north and west of Walk Farm	Freight handling area	Stratton Hall	Private Individual	Completely unsuitable, would lead to creation of a developed corridor linking towns of Ipswich and Felixstowe.	
288	Freight handling area	Freight handling area	Stratton Hall	Private individual	Major site submission which would create catastrophic threat to maintaining the separation of Ipswich and Felixstowe. Amount of land is far in excess of predicted land requirements for employment.	Comments noted. Land further south of site (site 706) identified instead for employment land related to sustaining the future of the Port of Felixstowe.
288	Freight handling area	Freight handling area	Stratton Hall	Private individual	Strongly opposed to any development of the land surrounding my property and the over development of land between the village	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					and Felixstowe as feel the negative impact of such developments far outweigh any positive impact on the village or local communities	
288	Freight handling area	Freight handling area	Stratton Hall	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
288	Freight handling area	Freight handling area	Stratton Hall	Private individual	Lodge objection to this site. A14 corridor is predominately agricultural land and to allow industrial employment development would significantly impinge on the beauty of the area. Not realistic for large scale port related operations to be east of the Orwell Bridge and the road infrastructure in the District cannot	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					realistically support further industrial development.	
288	Freight handling area	Freight handling area	Stratton Hall	SCC Highways	The A14 junction is left in left out and the same location as for site 706 below. The road to the north is a former A class road. Access to Ipswich difficult for workers using this site, involving driving to Trimley roundabout to U turn or driving through non-strategic routes. Very remote from other facilities very limited sustainable transport options for workers. HGV assess would not be acceptable without significant improvement to the A14 junction.	
131	Land at Woodlands Farm, Hyde Park Corner	Housing	Sudbourne	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Adjacent to Captain's and Sudbourne Great Woods CWS and Suffolk Wildlife Trust's Captain's Wood reserve. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in	Sudbourne is not a settlement in the Local Plan strategy for housing growth.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					an adverse impact on these sites.	
131	Land at Woodlands Farm, Hyde Park Corner	Housing	Sudbourne	Sudbourne Parish Council	Not feasible or desirable.	Site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
152	Land to the East of Wood Farm	Housing	Sudbourne	Sudbourne Parish Council	Not feasible or desirable.	Site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
152	Land to the East of Wood Farm	Housing	Sudbourne	Sudbourne Parish Council	We have also considered the Sustainability Assessments for the five sites identified as potential sites for development in Sudbourne, and conclude that these assessments rule out any early prospect of development on these sites, most especially No 152.	Sudbourne is not a settlement in the Local Plan strategy for housing growth.
152	Land to the East of Wood Farm	Housing	Sudbourne	SCC Highways	Narrow rural roads without footways would require significant improvement	
202	Land at Corner Farm, Snape Road	Housing	Sudbourne	Sudbourne Parish Council	Not feasible or desirable.	Comments noted however site identified as not available in Draft

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
468	Land to the east of Snape Road	Housing	Sudbourne	Sudbourne Parish Council	Not feasible or desirable.	Comments noted. Whilst site is identified as potentially suitable, Sudbourne is identified as countryside in the settlement hierarchy and therefore not considered for allocations.
468	Land to the east of Snape Road, Sudbourne, IP12 2AZ	Housing	Sudbourne	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Adjacent to Captain's and Sudbourne Great Woods CWS and Suffolk Wildlife Trust's Captain's Wood reserve. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	Sudbourne is not a settlement in the Local Plan strategy for housing growth.
508	Land at Snape Road, Sudbourne	Housing	Sudbourne	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to and Suffolk Wildlife Trust's Captain's Wood reserve. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in	Sudbourne is not a settlement in the Local Plan strategy for housing growth.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	
508	Land at Snape Road, Sudbourne	Housing	Sudbourne	Sudbourne Parish Council	Site currently subject of a proposed development of 17 houses.	
808	Land to the South of The Meadows	Housing	Sudbourne	Sudbourne Parish Council	Not feasible or desirable.	Comments noted. Whilst site is identified as potentially suitable, Sudbourne is identified as countryside in the settlement hierarchy and therefore not considered for allocations.
244	Land north Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Sutton	Private individual	Inadequate drainage for major part of the village, development of site will create undue burden on minor access road, broadband is totally inadequate and need for private motor car will cause air and noise pollution.	Comments noted. Site not preferred for allocation. Sutton is a small village and limited allocations are made.
244	Land north Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Sutton	Private individual	Concerned about access, mostly single track and poor visibility. Very poor sewer treatment provision in the village.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
244	Land north Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Sutton	Sutton Parish Council	Backland development not in keeping with the historic pattern of the village, access is only via a single track road not suitable for traffic.	
244	Land north Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Sutton	Private individual	No facilities in the village, access is a single track road, need private motor car to live in the village. Village does not need additional houses.	
244	Land north Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Sutton	Private individual	Access is mainly one lane road and development on this site would generate extra traffic. Sutton does not have any public transport, mobile and broadband connections are very poor.	
244	Land north Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Sutton	Private individual	Access to the Old Post Office lane site is totally inadequate, and not easily changed in an acceptable manner. It is also a major incursion into the rural area outside the village envelope - and in the AONB	
244	Land north Old	Housing	Sutton	Private	Post Office Lane is a narrow	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Post Office Lane			individual	country road. Not enough demand to warrant these houses and site is completely unsuitable. Little employment in the village and everybody would have to drive to access employment and services.	
244	Land north Old Post Office Lane	Housing	Sutton	Private individual	Old Post Office Lane is only a small single lane therefore it would not be able to cope with any amount of extra traffic that the development would bring. I feel that this development would not be right for the village at this current time	
387	land south of Sutton Walks, Main Road	Housing	Sutton	Private individual	Inadequate drainage for major part of the village, development of site will create undue burden on minor access road, broadband is totally inadequate and need for private motor car will cause air and noise pollution.	The comments have been considered in identifying preferred sites. The site considered suitable for allocation as Sutton is identified as a small village and has some potential for development. A smaller
387	land south of	Housing	Sutton	Sutton	This site has also been	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Sutton Walks, Main Road			Parish Council	turned down previously. If allowed it would be built on current agricultural land. Access would be difficult for the volume of traffic movements and Highways would have difficulty in agreeing to it.	part of the site than that submitted is proposed for development. The policy requires the development of the site to reflect the site's location in the AONB. The proposed site allocation requires the design and layout to reflect the linear nature of the village, and affordable housing would need to be provided. The SFRA does not identify issues related to flooding on the site albeit that there are other parts of Sutton which are identified as being at risk of surface water flooding. Suffolk County Council have not identified any issues related to access.
387	land south of Sutton Walks, Main Road	Housing	Sutton	Private individual	The Main Road site would appear to be for very large expensive housing which would completely change the nature of the village. It also intrudes into the rural area outside the village envelope - and in the AONB.	
320	Land north west of Eastbridge Farm	Housing	Theberton	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site adjacent to Minsmere-Walberswick Heaths & Marshes SSSI. Further assessment is required to	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation for development in the First

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					determine whether development in these locations is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	Draft Local Plan as below site size threshold.
320	Land north west of Eastbridge Farm	Housing	Theberton	J T Hancock and Associates	Although a more realistic site for infill type set between established development, three dwellings would need to small and sensitive matching the characteristics of other small developments in the settlement.	
322	Land south west of Red House Farm, Cemetery Road	Housing	Theberton	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site adjacent to Minsmere-Walberswick Heaths & Marshes SSSI. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in these locations is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation for development in the First Draft Local Plan due to Theberton & Eastbridge being identified as countryside in the settlement hierarchy.
322	Land south west of Red House Farm, Cemetery Road	Housing	Theberton	J T Hancock and Associates	Site forms a sensitive area providing part of the essential character of this area. 5 dwellings would represent significant	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					additional scale of development which would disturb character of settlement by increased activity, also detrimental to the AONB.	
957	Land to the north of Beacon Hill Lane	Housing	Thorpeness	Aldringham cum Thorpe Parish Council	Site previously discounted due to being remote from services, poorly related to physical limits, intrudes into AONB, in Heritage Coast, impacts on allotments and SSSI.	Comments noted however site identified as not available in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
957	Land to the north of Beacon Hill Lane, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Site previously rejected on appeal, access would be difficult and overdevelopment would have a negative impact on allotment gardens nearby. Additional volume of traffic would be detrimental to ambience of the village and endanger children, cyclists and pedestrians.	Comments noted. The site is not made available for consideration for allocation in the First Draft Local Plan. A neighbourhood plan is being prepared for the village that could allocate sites.
957	Land to the north of Beacon Hill Lane, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Site totally unacceptable, its abuts the AONB and supports bio-diverse habitats. Development would dramatically alter	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					unique setting of the area and reduce the natural beauty forever and loss of amenity for nearby residents.	
957	Land to the north of Beacon Hill Lane, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Site is an old dump and most unsuitable for development.	
957	Land to the north of Beacon Hill Lane, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Development of this site is not in the best interests of the local community, tourism and recreational activities, local employment and long term self-sustenance. Development of this site would change the heritage or the village.	
957	Land to the north of Beacon Hill Lane, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Development in this area would irretrievably prejudice the character of the old village, destroy the ecology of the location and lead to more second homes or holiday homes.	
957	Land to the north of Beacon Hill Lane, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Site should be discounted because of natural landscape, high level of environmental amenity and	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					heritage value of Thorpeness. Site is within the Heritage Coast and AONB and provides valuable habitat. Difficult to see how the site can be developed given the availability of better local sites.	
957	Land to the north of Beacon Hill Lane, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Development would damage irrevocably change the unique area of Thorpeness. Style of any development would look incongruous adjacent to the existing properties. Thorpeness does seem to be a particularly inappropriate area to develop as though it were the same as any other community village and not, as it is, a holiday village.	
959	Land to the west of Pilgrims Way	Housing	Thorpeness	Aldringham cum Thorpe Parish Council	Site previously discounted due to being remote from services, outside physical limits, intrudes into AONB, in Heritage Coast, impacts on SSSI and impacts on	Site identified as potentially suitable and the issues identified have been picked up through the SHELAA, however the Local Plan

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Conservation Area and Listed Building.	provides an opportunity for the Neighbourhood Plan to consider site allocations.
959	Land to the west of Pilgrims Way	Housing	Thorpeness	Private Individual	Land promoted for development.	Comments noted. Thorpeness is not identified for housing growth in the First Draft Local Plan strategy. A neighbourhood plan is being prepared for the village that could allocate sites.
959	Land to the west of Pilgrims Way, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	We believe that the site is already studied and considered to be favourable.	Comments noted. Thorpeness is not identified for housing growth in the First Draft
959	Land to the west of Pilgrims Way, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Better location adjacent to existing main road and bus route.	Local Plan strategy. A neighbourhood plan is being prepared for the
959	Land to the west of Pilgrims Way, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Proposed development of affordable housing is laudable but unaffordable to most wage earners in the Parish. There should be an inclusion for safe path/cycles to connect Thorpeness and Aldringham.	village that could allocate sites.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
959	Land to the west of Pilgrims Way, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Supportive of plans providing the necessary infrastructure is put in place and the site does not become second homes.	
959	Land to the west of Pilgrims Way, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	No objection in principle to the application providing it is enabling development.	
959	Land to the west of Pilgrims Way, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Site offers major siting advantages for phased development of affordable, sheltered and open market dwellings together with new leisure facilities.	
959	Land to the west of Pilgrims Way, Thorpeness	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Site would be suitable for social housing but of a restricted nature due to the lack of public transport. Should be single storey accommodation for the elderly.	
981	Land off Aldringham Road, Aldringham cum Thorpe	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	We believe that the site is already studied and considered to be favourable.	
981	Land off Aldringham Road,	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Better location adjacent to existing main road and bus route.	Comments noted. Thorpeness is not identified for housing growth in the First Draft Local Plan strategy. A neighbourhood plan is being prepared for the village that could

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Aldringham cum Thorpe					allocate sites.
981	Land off Aldringham Road, Aldringham cum Thorpe	Housing	Thorpeness	RSPB	Development in this area could result in increased recreational disturbance to the nearby Sandlings SPA.	
981	Land off Aldringham Road, Aldringham cum Thorpe	Housing	Thorpeness	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to the Sandlings SPA and Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	
981	Land off Aldringham Road, Aldringham cum Thorpe	Housing	Thorpeness	Thorpeness and Aldeburgh Hotels Limited	Suggest changes to the Sustainability Appraisal. Site promoted for mixed use, residential, leisure, sports and tourism uses in order to boost the attractiveness of the tourist offer in Thorpeness.	
981	Land off Aldringham Road, Aldringham cum Thorpe	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Would do little to adjust the social mix in Thorpeness and would certainly be very desirable to weekenders, buy to let owners. There	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					was talk of revitalising Thorpeness with a more permanent community. We do not think this particular development would further this	
981	Land off Aldringham Road, Aldringham cum Thorpe	Housing	Thorpeness	Private individual	Access would need to be agreed and would result in the loss of the practice range. More discussion needed with the Parish Council.	
981	Land off Aldringham Road, Aldringham cum Thorpe	Housing	Thorpeness	SCC Highways	No Footways and speed limit terminal adjacent to site. Unclear whether it is feasible to link to village centre.	
30	Land North East of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Comments noted. The site is not proposed for allocation reflecting the approach to housing growth in Trimley St Martin to be limited having regard to the focus for growth nearby in North Felixstowe.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
30	Land North East of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Martin	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	Parish Council oppose use of land to the west of Trimley St Martin and Kirton as they together with potential use of land for commercial use, contribute to the urbanisation of the green space between Ipswich and Felixstowe.	
30	Land North East of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Martin	SCC Highways	Speed limit amendment and footway extension/ crossing point required	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed Use	Trimley St Martin	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for flooding and archaeology.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and therefore Sustainability Appraisal not undertaken.
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed Use	Trimley St Martin	Trimley St Martin Parish Council	Landowner did not intend it to be considered on this occasion.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature	The site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	of Kirton Road				conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Site 356 again is good agricultural land 92ha is for mixed use – whatever that means as no one from planning could give a satisfactory answer when asked at a recent meeting.	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	We feel that none of the proposals put forward with relation to the PLDs we have referred to are suitable. The construction of a housing development in a village with no local services is pointless. The destruction of large amounts of strategically important agricultural land, in order to create commercial facilities that would be economically	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					disadvantaged due to their location, is frankly absurd.	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	For an area this size to be considered is just totally unacceptable - especially under a 'banner' of Mixed use. This area encompasses a bigger land mass than Kirton & Falkenham put together. The area certainly does not need a 'Ransomes' type development	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	At this moment in time I understand that the landowner did not intend it to be considered.	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	STRONGLY NEGATIVE. SCDC point out that part of the site is prone to flooding. It is believed that it also has surface streams. Contains habitats for protected species. This site abuts Kirton, Falkenham and Trimley St. Martin. It will therefore link these villages and lose their distinctiveness; the three	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					villages have very different character.	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	I believe the land owner is not aware of the request so I am guessing someone has done this to muddy the waters in the area and scare the Villagers in thinking that this could be another major development but the same applies to this site as 706 it is agricultural land we need to eat.	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Site is outside of the village boundaries and would effectively join Kirton to Trimley St Martin. We must maintain separation of villages.	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Strong objection on the grounds of poor access, traffic congestion, noise, light pollution, loss of farmland, loss of habitat and inadequate highways and drainage.	
356	Land surrounding	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	For an area this size to be considered is just totally	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road				unacceptable - especially under a 'banner' of Mixed use. This area encompasses a bigger land mass than Kirton & Falkenham put together. The area certainly does not need a 'Ransomes' type development	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Prime agricultural land should NEVER be used for industrial use & ONLY IN THE LAST RESORT for housing. As a nation we have to retain the option to be able to produce as much food as possible in times of crisis. In an uncertain world that is important to National Security. Rich and powerful landowners should not bulldoze the Council into making decisions that will adversely affect this community & possibly in the future, the nation. The road infrastructure is already at breaking point which is another reason why I am	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					also objecting to the developments proposed	
356	Land surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	SCC Highways	Access from Kirton Road may be possible at the south eastern end closer to the A14 roundabout but only limited access would be viable in Kirton village. Back Lane and Brook lane are not suitable for significant increases in traffic	
364	Land south 146 Kirton Road	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for transport.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and therefore Sustainability Appraisal not undertaken.
364	Land south 146 Kirton Road	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Trimley St Martin Parish Council	Site put forward by Parish Council previously, however no longer wish it to be considered.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
364	Land south 146 Kirton Road	Housing (assumed)	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	I understand that it is no longer intended to be subject of consideration.	The site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
364	Land south 146	Housing (assumed)	Trimley St	Kirton and	NEUTRAL IF DESIGNATED	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Kirton Road		Martin	Falkenham Parish Council	FOR PARKING. Adjacent to the school with major traffic and parking problems. If the site is developed it should be as a school parking and/or drop of facility. Does contain some protected species.	
364	Land south 146 Kirton Road	Housing (assumed)	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Could perceive maybe possible but at school times this road is nearly impassable due to the car parking along the road. May work if some of the land can be allocated for school car parking.	
364	Land south 146 Kirton Road	Housing (assumed)	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Objection on grounds of access, site not well integrated with village and loss of wildlife habitat	
364	Land south 146 Kirton Road	Housing (assumed)	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Road infrastructure in the area is already at breaking point.	
364	Land south 146 Kirton Road	Housing (assumed)	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Could there be a trade off? A few houses for a school car park to ease congestion at school drop off and pick up times?	
364	Land south 146	Housing (assumed)	Trimley St	Private	The School Parent Teachers	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Kirton Road		Martin	individual	Association have requested land for car parking, this has been refused.	
372	Land to the north of Heathfields	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Scott Properties	Land promoted for development.	Comments noted. The site is not allocated reflecting the approach to housing growth in Trimley St Martin to be limited having regard to the focus for growth nearby in North Felixstowe.
372	Land to the north of Heathfields	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Scott Properties	Site promoted for residential use targeted at older people.	Comments noted. The site is not proposed for allocation reflecting the approach to housing growth in Trimley St Martin to be limited having regard to the focus for growth nearby in North Felixstowe.
372	Land to the north of Heathfields	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
372	Land to the north of	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Levington & Stratton	Parish Council oppose use of land to the west of	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Heathfields			Hall Parish Council	Trimley St Martin and Kirton as they together with potential use of land for commercial use, contribute to the urbanisation of the green space between Ipswich and Felixstowe.	
372	Land to the north of Heathfields	Housing	Trimley St Martin	SCC Highways	Assessment of whether residential approach roads could accommodate additional traffic flows required	
497	Blue Barn Farm, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should not identify positive effects for transport.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and therefore Sustainability Appraisal not undertaken.
497	Blue Barn Farm, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Trimley St Martin Parish Council	Incorrectly located on the map	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
497	Blue Barn Farm, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Development in this location would urbanise the whole of Kirton Road. Number of cars an issue at	Comment reflected. The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					school drop off and pick up times.	through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
497	Blue Barn Farm, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Could perceive maybe possible but at school times this road is nearly impassable due to the car parking along the road. May work if some of the land can be allocated for school car parking.	
497	Blue Barn Farm, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Objection on grounds of access, site not well integrated with village and loss of wildlife habitat	
497	Blue Barn Farm, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Could there be a trade off? A few houses for a school car park to ease congestion at school drop off and pick up times?	
497	Blue Barn Farm, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Location incorrect	
497	Blue Barn Farm, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	The School Parent Teachers Association have requested land for car parking, this has been refused.	
497	Blue Barn Farm, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Road infrastructure is already at breaking point which would require access	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					points near dangerous bends on Kirton Road.	
511	Land adjacent to Reeve Lodge,	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Completely unsuitable, would lead to creation of a developed corridor linking towns of Ipswich and Felixstowe.	Site forms part of a preferred allocation to provide residential units, primary school, self build plots and open space. Development of the site does not extend Trimley beyond its current northern extent.
511	Land adjacent to Reeve Lodge,	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Trimley St Martin Parish Council	Not suitable as Trimley St Martin cannot accommodate more housing above that already allocated.	Site is proposed for allocation to support delivery of a new primary school.
511	Land adjacent to Reeve Lodge, High Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological	The site is proposed for allocation under policy SCLP12.62. The policy includes a requirement for an ecological assessment.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					impacts.	
511	Land adjacent to Reeve Lodge, High Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Pigeon Investment Management Limited	Site promoted for high quality residential, including self build accommodation, affordable homes, primary school, public amenity space, landscaping and associated development.	The site is proposed for allocation under policy SCLP12.62, including the uses outlined.
518	The Old Poultry Farm, High Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Completely unsuitable, would lead to creation of a developed corridor linking towns of Ipswich and Felixstowe.	Site identified as potentially suitable, however alternative site identified as proposed allocation.
518	The Old Poultry Farm, High Road	Mixed use	Trimley St Martin	Trimley St Martin Parish Council	Not suitable as Trimley St Martin cannot accommodate more housing above that already allocated.	
651	Land At High Road, Trimley St Martin	Self built pilot scheme	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological	Comments noted. The site is not proposed for allocation reflecting the approach to housing growth in Trimley St Martin to be limited having regard to the focus for growth nearby in North Felixstowe.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					impacts.	
651	Land At High Road, Trimley St Martin	Self built pilot scheme	Trimley St Martin	Pigeon Investment Management Limited	Site promoted to deliver new homes with the delivery of self-build plots, affordable homes, amenity space, landscaping and associated infrastructure.	
651	Land At High Road, Trimley St Martin	Self built pilot scheme	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	NEGATIVE. SCDC point out it will increase emissions, is on greenfield land and would be ribbon development. Protected species.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Trinity College, Cambridge	Land promoted for development	Site identified as a preferred site for employment allocation in the First Draft Local Plan.
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private Individual	Development would result in loss of farmland and creation of an industrial belt between Ipswich and Felixstowe	Comments noted and reflected in the policy requirements for the site. However, the site is identified from Local Plan economic evidence as being required for the long term land requirements to sustain the future of the Port of Felixstowe.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private Individual	Completely unsuitable, would lead to creation of a developed corridor linking towns of Ipswich and Felixstowe.	The site is identified from Local Plan economic evidence as being required for the long term land requirements to sustain the future of the Port of Felixstowe. The policy requires significant landscaping on the site to help to mitigate landscape impacts.
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council	Sustainability Appraisal should identify negative effects in relation to housing, health, quality of life, education, biodiversity and geodiversity, archaeology, prosperity and growth and transport. Query need for new warehousing.	Sustainability Appraisal identifies potential negative impacts in relation to air, material assets and cultural heritage. Impacts on air and material assets would be likely for any site proposed for this scale of use. The policy seeks to address landscape impacts by requiring significant landscaping of the site. The Port of Felixstowe identifies the need for provision for land for
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Trimley St Marin Parish Council	No evidence to show site this size is needed, storage and distribution will not generate many jobs, located adjacent to housing, issues of air, noise and light pollution, junction	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					would increase trip length, A14 / Croft Ln junction unsuited to large scale use, site is good agricultural land.	Port related uses. The policy requires access for traffic in easterly and westerly directions.
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Comments noted and reflected in the policy requirements for the site. However, the site is identified from Local Plan economic evidence as being required for the long term land requirements to sustain the future of the Port of Felixstowe.
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council	EXTREMELY NEGATIVE. Very serious risk of pollution to adjacent homes and school. Would need significant highway improvements, loss of agricultural land and site is far greater in size than that required in the evidence base and forecasting model.	
706	Innocence Farm,	Storage or distribution	Trimley St	Private	Alarmed at the proposed	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin		Martin	individual	development of this site, adds up to destruction of Kirton as a village. Plenty of brownfield sites at the docks, air pollution, light pollution, building on prime agricultural land, overbearing for the size of Kirton.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Strongly object to this site.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Strongly object, ill-considered and shameful to encourage urbanisation within this beautiful countryside landscape.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Very strong objection on grounds of poor access, noise, smell, light pollution, loss of farmland, loss of habitat	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	I would like to take the opportunity to totally condemn the Port of Felixstowe's push to develop these areas for	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Port use. The port has failed to plan and develop (if required) areas that they currently have access to. The idea of constructing a massive site including warehousing and rail sidings is abhorrent. One needs to look, long term at this supposed 'requirement' of the Port, because there is certainly not a need at present.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Would be irresponsible and controversial for the Council to allow such development. As a nation we have to retain the option to be able to produce as much food as possible in times of crisis. In an uncertain world that is important to National Security. Rich and powerful landowners should not bulldoze the Council into making decisions that will adversely affect this community & possibly in	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					the future, the nation.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Site 706 for storage or distribution is particularly unsuitable for any development as it is not needed. Port expansion has slowed and indeed shrunk in terms of trade. London Gateway is coming on stream, able to take the largest ships currently in operation, Southampton is growing to take trade from Felixstowe and Liverpool is poised to ship direct to America and receive likewise.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Some of the proposers I truly believe do not have the villages wellbeing, health and community in mind they are just interest in the money they will gain by the sale of the land.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Alarmed by the potential linking of Ipswich and Felixstowe into one urban sprawl. Would create catastrophic threat to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					maintaining the separation of the two towns and a major impact on the natural environment and the AONB.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Innocence Lane storage/distribution – this demands a large amount of land but little generation of employment. Therefore on the 115.6 hectares being suggested as Port related areas this would give max. pollution per hectare sacrificed and lowest employment plus loss of valuable farmland	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Very large site outside village boundaries. Would severely damage the local environment in terms of noise, smell, emissions and light pollution. Would require massively expensive access developments with road building. Some flooding on the site currently. Industrial use would adversely affect the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Special Landscape Area.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	I am also extremely concerned about the proposed plans for site 706 and strongly object. This will have an enormous effect on Kirton Village, that will completely change the area. It is crucial to understand the environmental impact and damage that this development will have on the local rural area. Light pollution, diesel fumes, noise and loss of habit to the wildlife are just a few areas that will affect standard of living in the surrounding villages	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	They are extremely ill-considered. It would be shameful to encourage urbanisation within this beautiful countryside landscape, with an unsuitable development that will cause huge visual impact and well as vast	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					amounts of pollution to the countryside.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	I also strongly object to the proposed plans for the development of this land for container use from Felixstowe Dock. The effect this would have on the surrounding villages would be great.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Cross Boundary Parish Council Group (Bucklesham, Kirton & Falkenham, Levington & Stratton Hall, Trimley St Martin, Trimley St Mary).	No evidence has been presented to show that a site of this size is required for port related uses, sites for which permissions already exist are not yet used within the vicinity of the port, land demand are large but do not generate large number of jobs. Impact on local area will be felt for many years to come with villages adversely affected. Site is close to primary school and playing field. Development reduces the gap between Ipswich and Felixstowe. Access and traffic would have a serious	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					impact. Environmental impact not been considered.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Will lead to continuous development between these two separate towns, with the result that one amorphous built-up area will be created. This is totally out of keeping with the Suffolk Coastal area, which is known for its predominantly rural landscape containing separate and distinct towns and villages. The destruction of large amounts of strategically important agricultural land, in order to create commercial facilities that would be economically disadvantaged due to their location, is frankly absurd.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	To concrete over top-grade agricultural land for industrial and housing development is foolishly short-sighted, also leading	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					to rainwater run-off flooding fields and further reducing crop yields. To do so on this site would be criminal. Pollution in the form of diesel particles, noise and light would seriously endanger the physical and mental health of the local population	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	With Ipswich expanding along side of the A14, with these proposed developments it would mean a continuous stretch of industrial waste land from the Orwell bridge to the sea. Site should also be rejected due to impact on wildlife, light pollution, position of the lorry park to the school and the pollution it will cause, and the traffic chaos that already exists would be worse. Is the school in a village or the centre of a major city with the children being subject to these dangers it will	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					create	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	Any developments on these areas would bring enormous increases in traffic, much of it HGVs, and place an unsustainable pressure on the local road infrastructure and the Orwell bridge. Would also be a substantial increase in noise, light and air pollution which would have a detrimental impact on local residents and natural environment. Any port related use of land must be firstly considered on a clear Statement of Need and not on some speculative venture by landowners or agents, vigorously scrutinised by SCDC using independent and expert consultants, and the use of brownfield land at the Port must also be taken into consideration.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton,	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	The site 706, innocence farm, and its proposed	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin				industrial makeover would devastate Trimley St martin and Kirton. Light and noise pollution 24 hours a day. lack of infrastructure and loss of a huge piece of prime agricultural land when surely with Brexit we need to be saving this. There are brownfield sites within the docs with planning for this kind of development that are unused due to lack of demand. SCDC should hang their heads in shame if they allow this to proceed as they would be doing so in the full knowledge of the impact it would have on the peninsula and those that call it home.	
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Very nature of the development would change from rural to industrial with a huge impact on Kirton and Trimley St Martin residents and their quality of life.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
706	Innocence Farm, Nr Kirton, Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Martin	SCC Highways	Innocence Lane and Kirton Road are not suitable for increased HGV traffic without substantial improvement. The A14 junction is left in left out, ideally this type of use would have access via an all movements junction. The junction (HE network) would require extensive modification to make it suitable for intensification of use, especially for HGV traffic. Other sites to the south of the A14 may be able to facilitate a larger junction scheme.	
756	Land South West of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological	Comments noted. The site is not proposed for allocation reflecting the approach to housing growth in Trimley St Martin to be limited having regard to the focus for growth nearby in North Felixstowe.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					impacts.	
756	Land South West of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Martin	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	Parish Council oppose use of land to the west of Trimley St Martin and Kirton as they together with potential use of land for commercial use, contribute to the urbanisation of the green space between Ipswich and Felixstowe.	
756	Land South West of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Martin	SCC Highways	Footway along frontage with ped crossing and links to village centre	
757	Land South of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Comments noted. The site is not proposed for allocation reflecting the approach to housing growth in Trimley St Martin to be limited having regard to the focus for growth nearby in North Felixstowe.
757	Land South of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Martin	SCC Highways	Access from Grimston Lane unlikely as improvements appears unfeasible. Direct link to High Road may be	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					required.	
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private Individual	Object to development due to loss of open space and agricultural land, urban sprawl, impacts on tourism, traffic and pollution and infrastructure.	Comments noted. Site not allocated for employment and land on the opposite side of the A14 is earmarked for Port related employment land in this Draft Plan.
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private Individual	Development would result in loss of farmland and creation of an industrial belt between Ipswich and Felixstowe	
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Trimley St Martin Parish Council	Could support small development but buildings would need to be sensitive to rural landscape.	
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation for employment and land on the opposite side of the A14 is proposed for allocation for Port related employment land in this Draft Plan.
852	Land opposite	Employment	Trimley St	Private	The major site submissions	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane		Martin	individual	creating this catastrophic threat to maintaining the separation of the two towns and a major impact on the natural environment and AONBs	
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Essential that if approved high quality high density employment with buildings that are discreet and in keeping with the adjacent area are the terms.	
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	The development of this site would lead to continuous development between these two separate towns, with the result that one amorphous built-up area will be created. This is totally out of keeping with the Suffolk Coastal area, which is known for its predominantly rural landscape containing separate and distinct towns and villages. Quite simply the road network in and around the Ipswich area is	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					unsuitable for the commercial activities envisioned. The destruction of large amounts of strategically important agricultural land, in order to create commercial facilities that would be economically disadvantaged due to their location, is frankly absurd.	
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	I would like to take the opportunity to totally condemn the Port of Felixstowe's push to develop these areas for Port use. The port has failed to plan and develop (if required) areas that they currently have access to. The idea of constructing a massive site including warehousing and rail sidings is abhorrent. One needs to look, long term at this supposed 'requirement' of the Port, because there is certainly not a need at present.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Development of port related activities on this site would have a significant negative impact on the local residents through noise and light pollution, particularly taking into account the 24 hour operations.	
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Site should be rejected because of impact on wildlife, light pollution, position of the lorry park to the school and the pollution it will cause, and the traffic chaos that already exists would be worse. Is the school in a village or the centre of a major city with the children being subject to these dangers it will create.	
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	Any developments on these areas would bring enormous increases in traffic, much of it HGVs, and place an unsustainable pressure on the local road infrastructure and the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Orwell bridge Would also be a substantial increase in noise, light and air pollution which would have a detrimental impact on local residents and natural environment. Any port related use of land must be firstly considered on a clear Statement of Need and not on some speculative venture by landowners or agents, vigorously scrutinised by SCDC using independent and expert consultants, and the use of brownfield land at the Port must also be taken into consideration.	
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	I think that it has been overlooked that it is also in the National Interest for the U.K. to be able to feed its population as much as possible. This area is the bread basket of the Country. These are politically uncertain times with BREXIT & tensions in	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					the World as a whole. Once good fertile land is built on it is gone forever.	
852	Land opposite Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	Employment	Trimley St Martin	SCC Highways	Consult Highways England - Would potentially increase use of substandard access onto A14.	
853	Land at Morston Hall Road and adjacent to the A14	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private Individual	Development would result in loss of farmland and creation of an industrial belt between Ipswich and Felixstowe	Comment noted. Site not allocated for employment and land on the opposite side of the A14 is earmarked for Port related employment land in this Draft Plan.
853	Land at Morston Hall Road and adjacent to the A14	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Trimley St Martin Parish Council	Could support small development but buildings would need to be sensitive to rural landscape.	
853	land at Morston Hall Road and adjacent to the A14	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Comment noted. Site not proposed for allocation for employment and land on the opposite side of the A14 is proposed for allocation for Port related employment land in this Draft Plan.
853	land at Morston	Employment	Trimley St	Private	Major site submission	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Hall Road and adjacent to the A14		Martin	individual	create a catastrophic threat the separation of the two towns and major impact on the natural environment and the AONB.	
853	land at Morston Hall Road and adjacent to the A14	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Essential that if approved high quality high density employment with buildings that are discreet and in keeping with the adjacent area are the terms.	
853	land at Morston Hall Road and adjacent to the A14	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	The development of this site would lead to continuous development between these two separate towns, with the result that one amorphous built-up area will be created. This is totally out of keeping with the Suffolk Coastal area, which is known for its predominantly rural landscape containing separate and distinct towns and villages. Quite simply the road network in and around the Ipswich area is unsuitable for the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					commercial activities envisioned. The destruction of large amounts of strategically important agricultural land, in order to create commercial facilities that would be economically disadvantaged due to their location, is frankly absurd.	
853	land at Morston Hall Road and adjacent to the A14	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	I would like to take the opportunity to totally condemn the Port of Felixstowe's push to develop these areas for Port use. The port has failed to plan and develop (if required) areas that they currently have access to. The idea of constructing a massive site including warehousing and rail sidings is abhorrent. One needs to look, long term at this supposed 'requirement' of the Port, because there is certainly not a need at present.	
853	land at Morston	Employment	Trimley St	Private	Development of port	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Hall Road and adjacent to the A14		Martin	individual	related activities on this site would have a significant negative impact on the local residents through noise and light pollution, particularly taking into account the 24 hour operations.	
853	land at Morston Hall Road and adjacent to the A14	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Site should be rejected because of impact on wildlife, light pollution, position of the lorry park to the school and the pollution it will cause, and the traffic chaos that already exists would be worse. Is the school in a village or the centre of a major city with the children being subject to these dangers it will create.	
853	land at Morston Hall Road and adjacent to the A14	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	Any developments on these areas would bring enormous increases in traffic, much of it HGVs, and place an unsustainable pressure on the local road infrastructure and the Orwell bridge Would also	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					be a substantial increase in noise, light and air pollution which would have a detrimental impact on local residents and natural environment. Any port related use of land must be firstly considered on a clear Statement of Need and not on some speculative venture by landowners or agents, vigorously scrutinised by SCDC using independent and expert consultants, and the use of brownfield land at the Port must also be taken into consideration.	
853	land at Morston Hall Road and adjacent to the A14	Employment	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	I think that it has been overlooked that it is also in the National Interest for the U.K. to be able to feed its population as much as possible. This area is the bread basket of the Country. These are politically uncertain times with BREXIT & tensions in the World as a whole. Once	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					good fertile land is built on it is gone forever.	
853	land at Morston Hall Road and adjacent to the A14	Employment	Trimley St Martin	SCC Highways	Consult Highways England - Would potentially increase use of substandard access onto A14.	
978	Land rear of Mill Lane	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Trimley St Martin Parish Council	Subject to planning application	Site has not been assessed as planning permission has been granted,
978	Land rear of Mill Lane, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Planning permission granted for housing development of the site.
978	Land rear of Mill Lane, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Private individual	Already subject to planning application	
978	Land rear of Mill Lane, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council	Parish Council would oppose this site, as together with the potential use of land for commercial	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					uses it would contribute to the urbanisation of the green space between Ipswich and Felixstowe.	
978	Land rear of Mill Lane, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	Pigeon Investment Management Limited	Site benefits from a resolution to grant full planning permission for 69 units. The legal agreement is at an advanced stage and has now been agreed by the relevant parties.	
978	Land rear of Mill Lane, Trimley St Martin	Housing	Trimley St Martin	SCC Highways	Access via High Road. Footway improvements.	
30	Land north east of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Mary	Trinity College, Cambridge	Land promoted for development	Site identified as potentially suitable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however site 511 provides an opportunity for a site for a new school for form a more central and focal part of the village.
114	Land at 182 High Road	Not specified	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						Availability Assessment
141	Land at Station Nursery, Cordys Lane	Employment	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
211	Land off Gaymers Lane and adjacent to 179 High Road	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
211	Land off Gaymers Lane and adjacent to 179 High Road	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Comments noted. The site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
446	Searsons Farm, Cordy's Lane	Housing and Open Space	Trimley St Mary	Trinity College, Cambridge	Land promoted for development	Site has been discounted as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
446	Searsons Farm, Cordy's Lane	Housing and Open Space	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
655	Land adj to 31-37 Bucklesham Road	Not specified	Trimley St Mary	Private individual	Site was previously marked as protected from development.	Comment noted. Site not proposed for allocation reflecting settlement coalescence.
655	Land adj to 31-37 Bucklesham Road	Not specified	Trimley St Mary	SCC Highways	Thurmans Lane would require significant improvement if used to access site	
665	Land adjacent to 33 Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – site is entirely within a designated Area to be Protected from Development.
667	Land to the north of Thurmans Lane and to the east of the A14	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. Additionally, Site identified as unsuitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – site is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						to the form of the settlement.
667	Land to the north of Thurmans Lane and to the east of the A14	Housing	Trimley St Mary	SCC Highways	Unclear how site would be accessed. Capel Hall Lane not suitable at existing width.	The site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
707	Christmasyards Wood	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Mary	Private individual	Completely unsuitable, would lead to creation of a developed corridor linking towns of Ipswich and Felixstowe.	Comments noted. An alternative site at Innocence Farm adjacent the A14 is allocated for Port related employment land.
707	Christmasyards Wood	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	
707	Christmasyards Wood, off Fagbury Road West, Felixstowe, IP11 4BB	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Mary	Private individual	We believe that development for port related activity would have a significant negative impact on the local residents through noise and light pollution, particularly taking into account the 24 hour operation of such facilities.	Comments noted. An alternative site at Innocence Farm adjacent the A14 is proposed for allocation for Port related employment land.
707	Christmasyards Wood, off Fagbury Road West,	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Mary	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Large blocks of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Felixstowe, IP11 4BB				Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	
707	Christmasyards Wood, off Fagbury Road West, Felixstowe, IP11 4BB	Storage or distribution	Trimley St Mary	SCC Highways	Adjacent to existing port area. Assumed that access would be via existing port infrastructure.	
758	Land West of High road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – However, it was deemed Site 511 (site allocation: SCLP12.63 is a more suitable site.
758	Land West of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Mary	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Further assessment is	Comments noted. The site is not proposed for allocation reflecting the approach to housing growth in Trimley St Mary to be limited

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	having regard to the focus for growth nearby in North Felixstowe.
758	Land West of High Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Mary	SCC Highways	Access from Gaymers Lane unlikely as improvements appears unfeasible. Direct link to High Road may be required.	
759	Land West of Port Felixstowe Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Mary	Trinity College, Cambridge	Land promoted for development	Site it within an Area to be Protected from Development and therefore is not suitable for allocation.
759	Land West of Port Felixstowe Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site identified as unsuitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – site is entirely within a designated Area to be Protected from Development.
759	Land West of Port Felixstowe Road	Housing and open space	Trimley St Mary	SCC Highways	New access road onto High Road required. Close to bridge.	Site identified as unsuitable as it is within a designated Area to be Protected from

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						Development..
790	Land adjacent to 33-37 Thurmans Lane	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
790	Land adjacent to 33-37 Thurmans Lane	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Private individual	Site was previously marked as protected from development.	The site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
790	Land adjacent to 33-37 Thurmans Lane	Housing	Trimley St Mary	SCC Highways	Thurmans Lane would require significant improvement if used to access site	
950	Land at Faulkners Way	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
950	Land at Faulkners Way	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Private individual	Site was previously marked as protected from development.	The site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.
985	Land at and surrounding Pooleys removals and storage,	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Private individual	Site was previously marked as protected from development.	The site is not made available for consideration in the Draft Local Plan.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Bentwaters Park					
985	Land at Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site identified as unavailable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
992	Land rear 194 High Road, off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary	Housing	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	No further sites in the Parish as few green spaces remain	Site is below 0.2ha and is therefore below the site size threshold for consideration for allocation.
135	Off Keightley Way	Housing	Tuddenham St Martin	Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council	No objection but indicative number of homes appears high. There are already parking problems.	Site identified as a preferred site. The density proposed is approximately 20 dwellings per hectare which is considered to be appropriate for a village. Landscaping will be required, and car parking will be expected to be provided in accordance with policy SCLP7.2.
216	Land adjacent to	Housing	Tuddenham	Tuddenham	No objection but indicative	Site identified as a

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Hilltop, Westerfield Lane		St Martin	St Martin Parish Council	number of homes appears high. There are already parking problems.	preferred site. The density proposed is approximately 20 dwellings per hectare which is considered to be appropriate for a village. Landscaping will be required, and car parking will be expected to be provided in accordance with policy SCLP7.2.
54	Land opposite Tunstall Hall, Snape Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	This is currently apparent waste ground and I would have thought a reasonable site for development. It would be accessed from a road capable of taking the traffic even though quite a busy road at times during the day.	Comments noted. Tunstall is a Small village in the Local Plan strategy. In the context of existing planning permissions for new housing, highways, services and the benefits of village growth, sites are proposed for allocation in other villages.
54	Land opposite Tunstall Hall, Snape Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Site 54 is believed to be a suitable site for a housing development within Tunstall in line with the 13 recommended homes. Development of Site 54 is believed to cause minimal environmental impact and	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					provide sustainable economic benefits to the village.	
54	Land opposite Tunstall Hall, Snape Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Only access to these three sites is from Snape Road which is a narrow two lane twisty road with very poor visibility and no footpath. However if highway works were carried out to straighten Snape Road giving proper visibility and safer access together with a pavement then development could be a possibility. This is largely fallow unused land within the village envelope.	
54	Land opposite Tunstall Hall, Snape Road	Housing	Tunstall	Tunstall Parish Council	Unsuitable. This is already a well-used piece of road with many bends and sight lines would be restricted posing hazards to any entrance to a development	
54	Land opposite Tunstall Hall, Snape Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Site 54 – this is already a well used piece of road with many bends and sight lines would be restricted posing	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					hazards to any entrance to a development.	
54	Land opposite Tunstall Hall, Snape Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Outside the physical limits boundary and a change of use from agriculture to housing would be detrimental to the rural character of Tunstall.	
108	Land adjacent to The Red House, Orford Road	Residential or retail	Tunstall	Gedgrave Estate	Site 108 neighbours 4 Grade II Listed properties, three to the west and one to the east and also lies within Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB. We would also question whether this site could be safely accessed from the busy main road through the village	Comments noted. Tunstall is a Small village in the Local Plan strategy. In the context of existing planning permissions for new housing, highways, services and the benefits of village growth, sites are proposed for allocation in other villages.
108	Land adjacent to The Red House, Orford Road	Residential or retail	Tunstall	Private individual	A development could contain provision for parking for the cottages opposite who currently use the edge of the road. It could make the corner safer especially if priority was given to Snape traffic rather than Orford traffic.	
108	Land adjacent to	Residential or retail	Tunstall	Tunstall	Unsuitable. Site is within	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	The Red House, Orford Road			Parish Council	the AONB and outside of physical limits boundary. Although the site is within the centre of the village access would be opposite or on top of a 4 way junction in the centre of the village.	
108	Land adjacent to The Red House, Orford Road	Residential or retail	Tunstall	Private individual	Subject to the provision of a pavement this is entirely suitable for a reasonably safe modest development. If a layby were to be a planning requirement then the development could include a small shop.	
108	Land adjacent to The Red House, Orford Road	Residential or retail	Tunstall	Private individual	The primary reason being that the area is designated as of Outstanding Natural Beauty and does not have the infrastructure to support any more development.	
108	Land adjacent to The Red House, Orford Road	Residential or retail	Tunstall	Private individual	Believe this area to have previously been designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and are unaware that this status has changed in recent	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					years.	
108	Land adjacent to The Red House, Orford Road	Residential or retail	Tunstall	Private individual	Would create congestion on an already dangerous junction. Vision at this junction is poor and cannot be improved due to the proximity of existing houses	
108	Land adjacent to The Red House, Orford Road	Residential or retail	Tunstall	Private individual	It is within an AONB and every effort must be made to protect this unique landscape. This site is also central to the visual amenity and rural character of the village.	
108	Land adjacent to The Red House, Orford Road	Residential or retail	Tunstall	Private individual	I object to their inclusion. Also Tunstall already has a major housing development underway without any planned improvement to the local infrastructure. I cannot support further development in my village under these circumstances.	
108	Land adjacent to The Red House, Orford Road	Residential or retail	Tunstall	Private individual	This village does not have sufficient infrastructure to support more dwellings	
194	land at Three Corners, Woodbridge	Not specified	Tunstall	Private individual	This site appears to be accessed from an unmade up track and currently is the	Comments noted. Tunstall is a Small village in the Local Plan

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road				home for several allotments. This site seems to be quite unsuitable for development.	strategy. In the context of existing planning permissions for new housing, highways, services and the benefits of village growth, sites are proposed for allocation in other villages.
194	land at Three Corners, Woodbridge Road	Not specified	Tunstall	Private individual	There are a number of properties on this land and no requirement to demolish can be justified.	
194	land at Three Corners, Woodbridge Road	Not specified	Tunstall	Tunstall Parish Council	Site is within historic settlement core, also within the AONB and outside of the physical limits boundary. Already houses and allotments on the site	
194	land at Three Corners, Woodbridge Road	Not specified	Tunstall	Private individual	Firmly believe the site should not be considered for development in Tunstall. Within the AONB and must be properly valued for the long term.	
194	land at Three Corners, Woodbridge Road	Not specified	Tunstall	Private individual	I object to their inclusion. Also Tunstall already has a major housing development underway without any planned improvement to the local infrastructure. I cannot support further development in my village under these circumstances.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
194	land at Three Corners, Woodbridge Road	Not specified	Tunstall	Private individual	Developing these sites would be counter to various policies of the Local Plan which seek conservation of the ANOB. I strongly object to their inclusion.	
194	land at Three Corners, Woodbridge Road	Not specified	Tunstall	Private individual	I am truly horrified about this proposal within the AONB. AONB's must be protected at all cost for the benefit of future generations , This particular AONB contains one of the finest landscapes in Britain	
194	land at Three Corners, Woodbridge Road	Not specified	Tunstall	Private individual	Site194 is also within the AONB and outside the physical limits boundary and, as above, development would impact substantially.	
214	Land at site of former allotments, off Tunstall Green	Not specified	Tunstall	Private individual	This is currently apparent waste ground and I would have thought a reasonable site for development. It would be accessed from a road capable of taking the traffic even though quite a busy road at times during the day.	Site is unavailable and therefore not being considered as part of this Local Plan

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
214	Land at site of former allotments, off Tunstall Green	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Have rights over some of the plot, also believe that neighbours have similar rights. It would be my suggestion that if the developers want to make use of the land it would be best to turn it back into allotments or some development which compliments the land rights, as selling it for houses is likely to cause multiple legal issues.	
214	Land at site of former allotments, off Tunstall Green	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	If highway works were carried out to straighten Snape Road giving proper visibility and safer access together with a pavement then development could be a possibility.	
214	Land at site of former allotments, off Tunstall Green	Housing	Tunstall	Tunstall Parish Council	There is no access through to this land. Any access would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Tunstall Green.	
214	Land at site of former allotments, off	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Vision at this junction is poor and cannot be improved due to the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Tunstall Green				proximity of existing houses. The scrapes on the walls and destruction to downpipes are testament to the difficulties that this junction currently experiences. Current lines of vision as you come from Snape down the Orford Road are appalling with no scope for these to be improved due to existing buildings.	
415	Land opposite Hall Garden Cottage, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Gedgrave Estate	Site 415 neighbours 4 Grade II Listed properties, three to the west and one to the east and also lies within Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB. We would also question whether this site could be safely accessed from the busy main road through the village	Comments noted. Tunstall is a Small village in the Local Plan strategy. In the context of existing planning permissions for new housing, highways, services and the benefits of village growth, sites are proposed for allocation in other villages.
415	Land opposite Hall Garden Cottage, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	This is currently apparent waste ground and I would have thought a reasonable site for development. It would be accessed from a	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					road capable of taking the traffic even though quite a busy road at times during the day.	
415	Land opposite Hall Garden Cottage, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	If highway works were carried out to straighten Snape Road giving proper visibility and safer access together with a pavement then development could be a possibility. This is largely fallow unused land within the village envelope.	
415	Land opposite Hall Garden Cottage, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Tunstall Parish Council	Unsuitable, this is already a well-used piece of road with many bends and sight lines would be restricted. Access to this site would be very dangerous and there are no services in the area.	
415	Land opposite Hall Garden Cottage, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Vision at this junction is poor and cannot be improved due to the proximity of existing houses. The scrapes on the walls and destruction to downpipes are testament to the difficulties that this junction currently	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					experiences. Current lines of vision as you come from Snape down the Orford Road are appalling with no scope for these to be improved due to existing buildings.	
415	Land opposite Hall Garden Cottage, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Outside of the physical limits boundary and a change of use from agriculture to housing would be detrimental to the rural character of Tunstall.	
464	Plunketts Barns, Blaxhall Church Road, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Gedgrave Estate	More physically separated from the village than our client's site and therefore less suitable than our client's site for development.	Comments noted. Tunstall is a Small village in the Local Plan strategy. In the context of existing planning permissions for new housing, highways, services and the benefits of village growth, sites are proposed for allocation in other villages.
464	Plunketts Barns, Blaxhall Church Road, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	This road is also unsuitable for pedestrian access. There are no footpaths on either single track road which means pedestrians have no choice but to mix with oncoming vehicles. This includes children making their way to Tunstall Green,	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					where their school bus stop is located. Site 464 will have a harmful overlooking or overbearing impact on neighbouring dwellings. I am one of those neighbouring dwellings and the majority of the land can be viewed from my garden and even my house which is set back an estimated 5m from the fence attached to the land.	
464	Plunketts Barns, Blaxhall Church Road, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	This site does not have good access from School Road which has houses on both sides at this point. If Blaxhall Church Road is widened at the junction, access to this site could be possible. Probably would need a large amount of new services and infrastructure.	
464	Plunketts Barns, Blaxhall Church Road, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Tunstall Parish Council	Unsuitable – single track road, used heavily by farm traffic.	
464	Plunketts Barns, Blaxhall Church Road, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	This has part commercial use and has been deemed suitable by the 2014 SHLAA	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					for housing. As the land borders both School Road and Blaxhall Church Road there could be access to the site on a "one way " basis from School Road with the exit route via Blaxhall Church Road which could be widened down to the junction thus giving safe entry and exit from the site.	
464	Plunketts Barns, Blaxhall Church Road, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Site is on single track roads that already struggle to cope with the volume of traffic. Both roads are used by school children who have to walk to catch the bus in the centre of the village. Increased traffic would cause further hazard to their journey as well as to locals who regularly need to walk on them and to those of us when we venture out onto the roads from our driveways.	
464	Plunketts Barns, Blaxhall Church Road, Tunstall	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Outside of the physical limits boundary and a change of use from	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					agriculture to housing would be detrimental to the rural character of Tunstall.	
543	Land North of School Road	Housing	Tunstall	Gedgrave Estate	More physically separated from the village than our client's site and therefore less suitable than our client's site for development.	Comments noted. Tunstall is a Small village in the Local Plan strategy. In the context of existing planning permissions for new housing, highways, services and the benefits of village growth, sites are proposed for allocation in other villages.
543	Land North of School Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	It is likely that the planning consideration on this site will be determined before the next version of the local plan is produced. If this is not the case, then I believe the factors which I mention below also resonate with this site.	
543	Land North of School Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	The nature and use conditions of the stretch of School Road onto this site would make the access absolutely inappropriate for further residential development. Site is outside of the Tunstall village envelope. It is claimed that development	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					on this site would contribute towards the Alde and Ore Association Estuary Appeal which I do not support.	
543	Land North of School Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	This proposed site is unacceptable. At this point the road is 11 feet wide (3.5 metres). Current houses are very near to the road, and access to this area as a development site is not possible. The road is a main artery for agricultural vehicles often as wide as the road itself. Most traffic travels too fast and this can be a dangerous road	
543	Land North of School Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Site is on a very narrow dangerous one car width "rat run" road which already has too much traffic, including articulated lorries and massive farm vehicles, and the danger inherent in gaining access to this road by the existing householders is such that it is wholly inappropriate for	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					any more properties to be built requiring such access	
543	Land North of School Road	Housing	Tunstall	Tunstall Parish Council	Unsuitable, the site has the same road issues as facing other sites and is also liable to regular flooding.	
543	Land North of School Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Site is on a single track roads that already struggle to cope with the volume of traffic. Both roads are used by school children who have to walk to catch the bus in the centre of the village. Increased traffic would cause further hazard to their journey as well as to locals who regularly need to walk on them and to those of us when we venture out onto the roads from our driveways.	
543	Land North of School Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Outside of the physical limits boundary and a change of use from agriculture to housing would be detrimental to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					the rural character of Tunstall.	
546	Land West of Blaxhall Church Road	Housing	Tunstall	Gedgrave Estate	Site promoted by the landowner for residential use.	Site not taken forward, significant issues in respect of access.
546	Land West of Blaxhall Church Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	This road is also unsuitable for pedestrian access. There are no footpaths on either single track road which means pedestrians have no choice but to mix with oncoming vehicles. This includes children making their way to Tunstall Green, where their school bus stop is located.	
546	Land West of Blaxhall Church Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Unless Blaxhall Church Road is widened at the junction, access to this site from Blaxhall Church Lane does not seem sensible. Presumably services would be available from the new development on Ashe Road.	
546	Land West of Blaxhall Church Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Site is of good agricultural land outside the village envelope and should not be considered. There are	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					exceptional surface water drainage problems with this site.	
546	Land West of Blaxhall Church Road	Housing	Tunstall	Tunstall Parish Council	Unsuitable, development on this site would result in Tunstall creeping towards Blaxhall. Access onto the road will be very dangerous.	
546	Land West of Blaxhall Church Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Site is on single track roads that already struggle to cope with the volume of traffic. Both roads are used by school children who have to walk to catch the bus in the centre of the village. Increased traffic would cause further hazard to their journey as well as to locals who regularly need to walk on them and to those of us when we venture out onto the roads from our driveways.	
546	Land West of Blaxhall Church Road	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Outside of the physical limits boundary and a change of use from agriculture to housing would be detrimental to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					the rural character of Tunstall.	
727	South of Snape Maltings	Tourism	Tunstall	Tunstall Parish Council	We believe that the plot should not have been coloured yellow for housing. Should the plot be used for overflow parking for Snape Maltings we would have no argument.	Comment reflected. The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
727	South of Snape Maltings	Tourism	Tunstall	SCC Highways	Footway from site to existing footway on B1069 required plus traffic free route to Maltings. Sufficient off road vehicle parking	
727	South of Snape Maltings	Tourism	Tunstall	Snape Maltings	Site promoted for car parking to support the activities at Snape Maltings.	
728	Land to the East of Snape Maltings	Tourism	Tunstall	Tunstall Parish Council	We believe that the plot should not have been coloured yellow for housing. Low lying and liable to flooding, very close to the river and may destroy the special landscape.	Comment reflected. The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the
728	Land to the East of Snape Maltings	Tourism	Tunstall	Snape Maltings	Site promoted for parking for special event overspill parking, such as the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Aldeburgh Food and Drink Festival.	settlement.
760	Land South of B1078	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	This seems a reasonable site as it is on a road capable of taking the traffic and with services.	Comments noted. Tunstall is a Small village in the Local Plan strategy. In the context of existing planning permissions for new housing, highways, services and the benefits of village growth, sites are proposed for allocation in other villages.
760	Land South of B1078	Housing	Tunstall	Private individual	Site is good agricultural land outside the village envelope and should not be considered.	
760	Land South of B1078	Housing	Tunstall	Tunstall Parish Council	Site is outside the physical limits boundary and a change of use from agriculture to housing would be detrimental to the rural character of Tunstall. Tunstall is already experiencing a substantial housing development with no positive change to the local infrastructure. It would be totally inappropriate to allocate additional land for housing without an improvement to local facilities and public transport. The car remains the main method of travel	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					to schools, shops and medical services.	
44	Adjacent to Bridge Cottage, Yarmouth Road	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	This site refers to the parcel of land next to Hillside Cottage which is currently under construction (DC/16/0836/FUL) Suitable (under construction)	Site is below the site size threshold and therefore not being taken forward in the Local Plan.
143	Land at Spring Lane and Yarmouth Road	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	Unsuitable - Southern parts of the site lie in areas of SWF. To the very south is an area of FZ3 and 2. Local Landscapes – Site is in SLA. The south east corner of the site is within 'Ufford Parklands' (Green infrastructure)	Comment reflected. The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
143	Land at Spring Lane and Yarmouth Road	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Particularly unsuitable, notably the sites on flood zones and encroaching on woodland	
143	Land at Spring Lane and Yarmouth Road	Housing	Ufford	SCC Highways	Footway widening required	
177	Land adjacent Brook House, Bealings Road	Employment	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	Unsuitable. Parish Council strongly object to the relocation of Woodbridge Town Football Club, because of increase traffic,	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation reflecting highways and coalescence issues, and

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					potential noise and light pollution	evidence employment needs are better provided for thorough other sites proposed for allocation.
177	Land adjacent Brook House, Bealings Road	Employment	Ufford	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in additional adverse impacts on the CWS. Also, in-combination with site 556, development at this site would result in the CWS being almost completely surrounded by development which would significantly reduce connectivity to the wide countryside.	
177	Land adjacent Brook House, Bealings Road	Employment	Ufford	Notcutts Limited	Site promoted by the landowner for a more positive land use.	
420	land east of Crownfields	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	Unsuitable. This field is part of the village landscape and fabric. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty when viewed from many different locations and as such is completely integral to the character and nature of the village. Any	Comments and landscape evidence reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for housing development.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					development on this land would completely destroy the special landscape and character of the village.	
420	land east of Crownfields	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Reject any future development on the margins of our unique water meadows. Would lead to loss of irreplaceable habitats. Development on this site would be against the NPPF and the Core Strategy policies as well as the Ufford Conservation Area Appraisal.	
420	land east of Crownfields	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	The number and scale of many of these developments are wholly out of proportion to Ufford and would severely damage the nature of the community, not to mention demand infrastructure and services which are simply not in place.	
420	land east of Crownfields	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	This field is part of the village landscape and fabric. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty when	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					viewed from many different locations and as such is completely integral to the character and nature of the village. Any development on this land would completely destroy the special landscape and character of the village. The land is used by many residents for dog walking, recreational activities	
420	land east of Crownfields	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Strongly register objection to development on this site.	
420	land east of Crownfields	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Any development of these sites will cause flooding to Midsummer Cottage in heavy rainfall — from which, of course, we would need proper flood protection installed by the council if development is permitted on these sites	
424	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	Unsuitable. Development here would impinge on views described in the Ufford Conservation Area Review. It is the LA's duty to preserve the Conservation	Comments and landscape evidence reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for housing development.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					Area	
424	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Reject any future development on the margins of our unique water meadows. Would lead to loss of irreplaceable habitats. Development on this site would be against the NPPF and the Core Strategy policies as well as the Ufford Conservation Area Appraisal.	
424	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	The number and scale of many of these developments are wholly out of proportion to Ufford and would severely damage the nature of the community, not to mention demand infrastructure and services which are simply not in place.	
424	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	They are a haven for local wildlife (see above) and as such are completely unsuitable for development.	
424	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford,	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Strongly register objection to development on this site.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	IP13 6DU					
424	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Any development of these sites will cause flooding to Midsummer Cottage in heavy rainfall — from which, of course, we would need proper flood protection installed by the council if development is permitted on these sites	
425	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	Unsuitable. Development here would impinge on views described in the Ufford Conservation Area Review. It is the LA's duty to preserve the Conservation Area	Comment reflected. The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land
425	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Reject any future development on the margins of our unique water meadows. Would lead to loss of irreplaceable habitats. Development on this site would be against the NPPF and the Core Strategy policies as well as the Ufford Conservation Area Appraisal.	Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
425	Land off Barrack	Housing	Ufford	Private	The number and scale of	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU			individual	many of these developments are wholly out of proportion to Ufford and would severely damage the nature of the community, not to mention demand infrastructure and services which are simply not in place.	
425	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	They are a haven for local wildlife (see above) and as such are completely unsuitable for development.	
425	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Strongly register objection to development on this site.	
425	Land off Barrack Lane, Ufford, IP13 6DU	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Any development of these sites will cause flooding to Midsummer Cottage in heavy rainfall — from which, of course, we would need proper flood protection installed by the council if development is permitted on these sites	
426	Land at East Lane, Ufford	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	Unsuitable. East Lane, a no through road, runs along the base of a large	Comment reflected. The site has been identified as not suitable for

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					escarpment to its north. Water percolates down the hill to emerge as a line of springs on the south side of the lane. The result is instability of the subsoil under the lane, which was built for horses and carts.	housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
426	Land at East Lane, Ufford	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Reject any future development on the margins of our unique water meadows. Would lead to loss of irreplaceable habitats. Development on this site would be against the NPPF and the Core Strategy policies as well as the Ufford Conservation Area Appraisal.	
426	Land at East Lane, Ufford	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	The number and scale of many of these developments are wholly out of proportion to Ufford and would severely damage the nature of the community, not to mention demand infrastructure and services which are simply not in place.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
426	Land at East Lane, Ufford	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Strongly register objection to development on this site.	
472	Land Adjacent to Keeper's Cottage High Street	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	This site is poorly related to the village and outside the physical limits boundary	Comment reflected. The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
472	Land Adjacent to Keeper's Cottage High Street	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Particularly unsuitable, notably the sites on flood zones and encroaching on woodland	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
488	Land South of 'Cambrai', Yarmouth Road	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	This site is poorly related to the village and outside the physical limits boundary	Comment reflected. The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
512	Land at Lodge Road, Ufford	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	Loss of agricultural land, area of historic and architectural importance, appeal decisions concluded “a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area”.	Comments reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for housing development. Ufford is a Small village in the Local Plan strategy. In the context of recent housing growth and existing planning permissions for new housing, highways, services and the benefits of village growth site are allocated in other villages.
556	Grove Farm	Housing/Business and office	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	This site is poorly related to the village and outside the physical limits boundary	The site has been identified as not suitable for housing development through
556	Grove Farm	Housing/Business and office	Ufford	Suffolk	Further assessment is	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
				Wildlife Trust	required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in additional adverse impacts on the CWS. Also, in-combination with site 177, development at this site would result in the CWS being almost completely surrounded by development which would significantly reduce connectivity to the wide countryside.	the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
556	Grove Farm	Housing/Business and office	Ufford	Private individual	Strongly register objection to development on this site.	
556	Grove Farm	Housing/Business and office	Ufford	Clarke & Simpson	Site promoted by landowner for residential use.	
561	Crown Nursery, High Street	Housing/Open Space/Office/Care Home	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	This site is poorly related to the village and outside the physical limits boundary	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation reflecting highways, lack of clarity about the nature and emphasis of employment use and lack of integration with the village. Evidenced employment needs are
561	Crown Nursery, High Street	Housing/Open Space/Office/Care Home	Ufford	Private individual	Strongly register objection to development on this site.	
561	Crown Nursery, High Street	Housing/Open Space/Office/Care Home	Ufford	Artisan PPS Ltd	Site promoted for employment and residential use by the landowner.	
561	Crown Nursery, High Street	Housing/Open Space/Office/Care Home	Ufford	Private individual	Development of Crown Nurseries has	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					demonstrated that Ufford is completely unsuitable to further development. Caused significant chaos even before completion and destroyed a once spectacular landscape.	better provided for through other sites proposed for allocation.
811	Land adj to houses at Lodge Road, High Street	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	Loss of agricultural land, flooding, adjacent to the Special Landscape Area and refer to a appeal decision which refused application on this site.	Site is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
811	Land adj to houses at Lodge Road, High Street	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Strongly register objection to development on this site.	
908	Land in between A12 and Yarmouth Road	Mixed use	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	This site is unrelated to the village and it is a greenfield site	
908	Land in between A12 and Yarmouth Road	Mixed use	Ufford	Private individual	Strongly register objection to development on this site.	Site is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
908	Land in between A12 and Yarmouth Road	Mixed use	Ufford	Notcutts Ltd	Site promoted by the landowner to accommodate the relocation of Woodbridge Town Football Club	
908	Land in between	Mixed use	Ufford	SCC	New access onto	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	A12 and Yarmouth Road			Highways	northbound A12 may be required. Significant cost and third party land to provide.	
909	Land in between A12 and Yarmouth Road	Mixed use	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	This site is unrelated to the village and it is a greenfield site	Site is not taken forward due to significant constraints regarding access.
909	Land in between A12 and Yarmouth Road	Mixed use	Ufford	Private individual	Strongly register objection to development on this site.	
909	Land in between A12 and Yarmouth Road	Mixed use	Ufford	Notcutts Ltd	Site promoted by the landowner to accommodate the relocation of Woodbridge Town Football Club	
1054	Land adj. Copse Corner, Byng Hall Road, Ufford	Housing	Ufford	Ufford Parish Council	This site is unrelated to the village and it is a greenfield site	Comments noted. The lack of integration with the village is reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for housing development..
1054	Land adj. Copse Corner, Byng Hall Road, Ufford	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	Strongly register objection to development on this site.	
1054	Land adj. Copse Corner, Byng Hall Road, Ufford	Housing	Ufford	Private individual	The proposed 1054 plot is immediately adjacent to the A12 so I would suggest that this is not the most suitable site for a future development. If not already	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					done so I would urge you to visit Byng Hall Road for a site visit to view for yourself the entrance and the impact that any development would have.	
1054	Land adj. Copse Corner, Byng Hall Road, Ufford	Housing	Ufford	SCC Highways	Significant improvements to Byng Hall Road required to link site to local amenities	
82	Land adj Rose Cottage, Fishpond Road	Housing	Waldringfield	Waldringfield Parish Council	Impact on the AONB, poorly related to the existing settlement and highway capacity. Site is also outside of the physical limits boundary and the Parish Council note that this land has not been put forward by the current owner.	Comments noted. The site is not preferred for allocation. This reflects its location between environmental designations around the Deben Estuary and planned strategic development at Adastral Park. Site is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
395	land at Gorse Farm, Newbourne Road	Housing	Waldringfield	Waldringfield Parish Council	Not suitable, poorly related to the existing settlement. Open fields provide separation between Adastral Park and the AONB and helps to reduce visual	Comments noted. The site is not preferred for allocation. This reflects its location between environmental designations around the

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					impact.	
395	land at Gorse Farm, Newbourne Road	Housing	Waldringfield	Private individual	Buffer zone between Adastral Park and Waldringfield, borders the AONB. Road between Brightwell and Waldringfield is already busy at peak times. Parking at Waldringfield is at bursting point and the inclusion of this plot of land threatens to destroy the community of Waldringfield.	Deben Estuary and planned strategic development at Adastral Park. Site is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
395	land at Gorse Farm, Newbourne Road	Housing	Waldringfield	Private individual	Outside of the village envelope and poor transport links, narrow roads with no pavements which are becoming dangerous for walkers and cyclists. Inadequate buffer between the AONB and Adastral Park. I should point out that site 395 identified on map comprises three separate plots. As owner of the plot in the centre, I have no intentions for any	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					development.	
395	land at Gorse Farm, Newbourne Road	Housing	Waldringfield	SCC Highways	No links to village amenities, cost of provision may be unfeasible.	
509	Waldringfield Golf Club, Newbourne Road, IP12 4PT	Leisure/housing/tourism	Waldringfield	Waldringfield Parish Council	Is not suitable as it is outside the East of Ipswich development area, is within the AONB and is outside the physical limits boundary of Waldringfield.	Comments noted. The site is not preferred for allocation. This reflects its location between environmental designations around the Deben Estuary and planned strategic development at Adastral Park. Site is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
509	Waldringfield Golf Club, Newbourne Road, IP12 4PT	Leisure/housing/tourism	Waldringfield	Private individual	Object to the inclusion of this site. Potentially this would become another fill in area between Gorse Farm and Waldringfield. Development would result in loss of habitat for birds and other wildlife. Area borders the AONB.	
509	Waldringfield Golf Club, Newbourne Road, IP12 4PT	Leisure/housing/tourism	Waldringfield	Private individual	An established leisure facility within the AONB, should not be developed further. Any extra development which increases the traffic flow on the adjacent rural road network should be resisted.	
509	Waldringfield	Leisure/housing/tourism	Waldringfield	SCC	No links to village	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Golf Club, Newbourne Road, IP12 4PT		d	Highways	amenities, cost of provision may be unfeasible	
419	land south of Halesworth Road	Housing	Walpole	Private individual	Concerned about the loss of delightful rural views if this site is developed.	Comment noted. Walpole is identified as countryside and Local Plan avoids allocating in these locations.
711	Land adj. to Blacksmiths Cottage, Halesworth Road, Walpole	Housing	Walpole	Private individual	Concerned about the loss of delightful rural views if this site is developed.	Comment noted. Walpole is identified as countryside and Local Plan avoids allocating in these locations.
58	Land adjacent to Brackenway, Blackheath Road, Wenhaston	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Site was subject to a planning application which was refused on substantial grounds.	Site below the site size threshold and not taken forward in this Local Plan.
58	Land adjacent to Brackenway, Blackheath Road, Wenhaston	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Site promoted as an alteration to the existing physical limits boundary, with opportunity for two smaller properties to be accommodated.	
58	Land adjacent to Brackenway, Blackheath Road, Wenhaston	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Very small site, which should be excluded from allocation due to its size.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
58	Land adjacent to Brackenway, Blackheath Road, Wenhaston	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Objection due less than 0.2h SLA. Outside boundary. Previously refused Building Permission.	
58	Land adjacent to Brackenway, Blackheath Road, Wenhaston	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	I believe planning permission was refused because of access issues. You will need to check your records. Frankly I think approval should have been given.	
203	Land adjacent to Brick Kiln Farm, Mells	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Object, countryside, Special Landscape Area and not well connected to any settlement.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
203	Land adjacent to Brick Kiln Farm, Mells	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	I think the people of Mells are better placed to comment.	
203	Land adjacent to Brick Kiln Farm, Mells	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	This is viable agricultural land, surrounded by agricultural land, off a single-track road, in the countryside and not well connected to any settlement.	
203	Land adjacent to Brick Kiln Farm, Mells	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	This site is outside the settlement boundary and lies within SLA. Housing on	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					this scale would require facilities that are not available at Mells and on this basis the site is unsustainable.	
203	Land adjacent to Brick Kiln Farm, Mells	Housing	Wenhaston	SCC Highways	No footways close to site. No ped links to amenities.	
205	Land at Glenholme, Blackheath Road	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Objection due outside boundary. SLA Not well connected flood risk.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
205	Land at Glenholme, Blackheath Road	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Has been submitted before and then withdrawn. See no objection to its inclusion	
205	Land at Glenholme, Blackheath Road	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Outside boundary, not well connected, in the SLA.	
229	Land between Hill Farm and Braeside, Blyford Lane	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	I believe that this was the subject of planning application 12/0458 which was approved and has since been built. If otherwise the site will be outside the boundary, in the AONB and less than 0.2 hectares so not normally considered by this consultation.	Site below the size threshold and therefore not for consideration in this Local Plan.
229	Land between	Housing	Wenhaston	Private	This is small and outside the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Hill Farm and Braeside, Blyford Lane			individual	remit of the Local Plan and in general I have no objection to small developments of 1 or 2 homes in appropriate places, but do not agree with development in AONB unless there are very special circumstances where the benefits to the community would outweigh the harm to the landscape.	
229	Land between Hill Farm and Braeside, Blyford Lane	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Objection, AONB, flood risk and less than 0.2ha	
229	Land between Hill Farm and Braeside, Blyford Lane	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Believe this has already been developed	
229	Land between Hill Farm and Braeside, Blyford Lane	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	See no objection	
462	Land to the East of Star Public House and South of St. Michaels Way	Housing	Wenhaston	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is adjacent to Blackheath CWS. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft SHELAA, the Council supports a review of the

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					location is likely to result in an adverse impact on this site.	Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for planning for housing development
462	Land to the East of Star Public House and South of St. Michaels Way	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	In the AONB, Saxon burial site, outside the boundary, outstanding views in and out of the Parish and flood risk as is already seen on adjacent site already developed.	
462	Land to the East of Star Public House and South of St. Michaels Way	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Strongly object to the inclusion of this land. Agricultural land and AONB. Land is also a Saxon burial site and views from it form part of the rural back drop. Site is also outside of the physical limits boundary and would effectively merge two areas.	
462	Land to the East of Star Public House and South of St. Michaels Way	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Objection: AONB Agricultural, Saxon Burial Site flood risk.	
462	Land to the East of Star Public House and South of St. Michaels	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Contrary to the neighbourhood plan; in the AONB and a site of historical importance.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Way					
462	Land to the East of Star Public House and South of St. Michaels Way	Housing	Wenhaston	SCC Highways	Footway link to primary school required on Hall Road. Bank would limit visibility from access onto Hall Road (removal required)	
473	Land Adjacent to Heath Road Wenhaston Ted's Field	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Single track road, upgrades needed to water, sewage, electricity and telephone.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
473	Land Adjacent to Heath Road Wenhaston Ted's Field	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Outside the boundary on single track unmade lane which regularly floods. Not well connected to settlement.	
473	Land Adjacent to Heath Road Wenhaston Ted's Field	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Understand that this site is at high risk of flooding as well as being some way outside the settlement boundary.	
473	Land Adjacent to Heath Road Wenhaston Ted's Field	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Objection: Agricultural outside boundary. Access poor flood risk	
473	Land Adjacent to Heath Road Wenhaston Ted's Field	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Outside the village envelope contrary to the neighbourhood plan.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
558	Land West of Back Road	Housing / open space	Wenhaston	John Hill Farms	Land promoted for development.	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, the Council supports a review of the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for planning for housing development
558	Land West of Back Road	Housing/open space	Wenhaston	John Hill Farms	Site promoted by the landowner for residential use.	
558	Land West of Back Road	Housing/open space	Wenhaston	Private individual	Single track road, upgrades needed to water, sewage, electricity and telephone	
558	Land West of Back Road	Housing/open space	Wenhaston	Private individual	Agricultural land, outside boundary off single track lane with surface water flooding risk.	
558	Land West of Back Road	Housing/open space	Wenhaston	Private individual	Objection Agricultural, outside boundary, poor access surface water from field causes flooding of culvert downstream	
558	Land West of Back Road	Housing/open space	Wenhaston	Private individual	Outside the village envelope contrary to the	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					neighbourhood plan	
564	Land between Blyford Lane & Coles Hill	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	This was the subject of planning application 15/2765 which was refused on substantial grounds.	Whilst the site is identified as potentially suitable in the Draft SHELAA, the Council supports a review of the Neighbourhood Plan as the mechanism for planning for housing development
564	Land between Blyford Lane & Coles Hill	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	This site has already been refused. It is an agricultural site outside the settlement boundary that has SLA status. There is also a flood risk and contamination.	
564	Land between Blyford Lane & Coles Hill	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Objection: Agricultural outside boundary Planning permission previously refused flood risk and contamination SLA	
564	Land between Blyford Lane & Coles Hill	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	A steeply sloping site with poor road access - less than ideal for building on.	
564	Land between Blyford Lane & Coles Hill	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Turned down because of drainage issues. Check your records.	
564	Land between Blyford Lane & Coles Hill	Housing	Wenhaston	David Houchell	Site promoted on behalf of the landowner.	
928	Land west of the Street	Housing / leisure / open space	Wenhaston	John Hill Farms	Land promoted for development.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
928	Land west of the Street	Housing/leisure/open space	Wenhaston	John Hill Farms	Site promoted by the landowner for residential use.	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation reflecting highways issues.
928	Land west of the Street	Housing/leisure/open space	Wenhaston	Private individual	Historic heart of the village, agricultural land, outside boundary.	
928	Land west of the Street	Housing/leisure/open space	Wenhaston	Private individual	Outside of the village boundary and no evidence to support the need for this.	
928	Land west of the Street	Housing/leisure/open space	Wenhaston	Private individual	Not enough info re: mix	
928	Land west of the Street	Housing/leisure/open space	Wenhaston	Private individual	928 – has been given approval before but that approval has lapsed, issue with surface water, could not be resolved. Check your records. If these issues are resolved could be a site for the local plan.	
1074	land west of Herons Nest, Church Road, Wenhaston	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Less then 0.2 hectares	Comments reflected in the small site not being proposed for allocation.
1074	land west of Herons Nest, Church Road, Wenhaston	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	Very small site which should be excluded from the Local Plan.	
1074	land west of	Housing	Wenhaston	Private	Narrow Lane which	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Herons Nest, Church Road, Wenhaston			individual	struggles to cope with traffic using it. Development of this area would be out of keeping with the surrounding environment.	
1074	land west of Herons Nest, Church Road, Wenhaston	Housing	Wenhaston	Private individual	A single track road/Lane already cannot cope with the traffic... events at the church mean the road is often completely block leaving residents to park at the bottom of the road and walk to their houses. Outside of the envelope and a major development up the road. Do we need to extend the boundaries and build on isolated plots in areas where facilities just cannot cope?	
80	Land adj Linden House, Lower Road	Housing	Westerfield	Westerfield Parish Council	Should be rejected due to poor access.	Site identified as unavailable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
125	Westerfield Road, adjacent to Cubitt's site	Housing	Westerfield	Westerfield Parish Council	Should be rejected as it should remain as a green space.	Site identified as potentially suitable in

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
125	Westerfield Road, adjacent to Cubitt's site	Housing	Westerfield	Greenways Project	Important wildlife habitat and provides opportunity for creation of 'green rim' around Ipswich.	Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however not identified as an allocation. Existing allocation in Westerfield carried over into new Local Plan.
160	Land at Mill Farm, Westerfield Road	Housing or employment	Westerfield	Westerfield Parish Council	No objection	Site is not available and therefore not being taken forward in the Local Plan.
160	Land at Mill Farm, Westerfield Road	Housing or employment	Westerfield	Private individual	Site has a number of positive elements in terms of environment and community. Site within walking distance of train station, on a bus route, close to employment and schools with services readily available.	Site is not available and therefore not being taken forward in the Local Plan.
168	Land at Lower House Farm, Lower Road	Housing	Westerfield	Westerfield Parish Council	No objection to development of this site.	Site is not available and therefore not being taken forward in the Local Plan.
192	Land opposite Corner Croft, Sandy Lane	Housing	Westerfield	SCC Highways	Footway link existing footway on Lower Road required (large distance)	The strategy for Westerfield is to rely on an existing local plan

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						housing allocation and allow the village to assimilate impacts of the nearby Ipswich Garden Suburb.
192	Land opposite Corner Croft, Sandy Lane	Housing	Westerfield	Westerfield Parish Council	Should be rejected due to being agricultural land and having no paths.	Site identified as potentially suitable, however access is identified as an issue.
521	Land north of Church Lane, west of Moss Lane	Housing	Westerfield	Westerfield Parish Council	No objection	Site is identified as potentially suitable in the SHELAA but is not proposed for allocation.
684	Land adjacent to Westerfield Railway	Housing	Westerfield	Westerfield Parish Council	Should be a high priority for development as a brownfield site.	Site identified as potentially suitable in Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment however not identified as an allocation. Existing allocation in Westerfield carried over into new Local Plan.
712	Land south of Lower Road	Housing	Westerfield	Westerfield Parish Council	Is already allocated	The site has not been assessed as it is already allocated in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD.
805	Land adj Old	Open space	Westerfield	Tuddenham	Strong objection as would	Site made available for

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Glebe House, Main Road			St Martin Parish Council	impinge on separation of the village from Ipswich.	open space (incorrectly shown as housing in Issues and Options document)
805	Land adj Old Glebe House, Main Road	Open space	Westerfield	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Development in this area could also conflict with the Ipswich 'Green Rim' being proposed by Ipswich Borough Council as part of their Local Plan, this could result in significant detrimental impacts on the potential availability of greenspace in and around the town. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Site not taken forward as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
805	Land adj Old Glebe House, Main Road	Open space	Westerfield	SCC Highways	Remote from local amenities. Significant length of footways	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					required.	
806	Land adj to Giffords, Tuddenham Lane	Open space	Westerfield	Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council	Strong objection as would impinge on separation of the village from Ipswich.	Site made available for open space (incorrectly shown as housing in Issues and Options document)
806	Land adj to Giffords, Tuddenham Lane	Open space	Westerfield	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site represents a large block of land which is likely to contain species and/or habitats of nature conservation interest. Development in this area could also conflict with the Ipswich 'Green Rim' being proposed by Ipswich Borough Council as part of their Local Plan, this could result in significant detrimental impacts on the potential availability of greenspace in and around the town. Further assessment is therefore required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in any adverse ecological impacts.	Site not taken forward as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
806	Land adj to	Open space	Westerfield	SCC	Remote from local	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Giffords, Tuddenham Lane			Highways	amenities. Significant length of footways required.	
848	land to the east of Westerfield Hall Farm, Westerfield Road	Housing	Westerfield	SCC Highways	Footway along frontage with crossing linking to existing footway. Extension of 30 mph speed limit.	Site is unavailable and therefore is not being taken forward.
4	land to the rear of Sunnyside, The Hill	Housing	Westleton	Westleton Parish Council	We are against development, access is only available via White's Lane an unmade single track bridleway.	Comments regarding the site's availability, vehicle access and environmental setting are reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation.
4	land to the rear of Sunnyside, The Hill	Housing	Westleton	Gregsons Solicitors	Site withdrawn and confirmed as not being available by the landowner.	
4	land to the rear of Sunnyside, The Hill	Housing	Westleton	Amedee Turner	Site not available for development, an integral part of the 13-acre unitary garden of the Barn Westleton.	
4	land to the rear of Sunnyside, The Hill	Housing	Westleton	Northland Ltd	Small site covered by trees on the edge of the conservation area. Potential impact on setting of a listed building.	
371	Land at Cherry Lee, Darsham Road	Housing	Westleton	Westleton Parish Council	Support development of this site.	Westleton is identified as a small village in the settlement hierarchy

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						and is identified as having some potential for growth. Highways and environmental issues reflected in the preferred site for allocation being 554 at the south of the village.
371	Land at Cherry Lee, Darsham Road	Housing	Westleton	Northland	Land promoted for development.	Site identified as potentially suitable in SHELAA, however with issues related to access.
407	land to the east of Wash Lane	Housing	Westleton	Westleton Parish Council	We are against development on this site, adjacent to a grade II listed building.	Site is unavailable and therefore is not being taken forward.
407	land to the east of Wash Lane	Housing	Westleton	Northland Ltd	Site within a conservation area and close proximity to listed buildings. Development on this site has a high chance of harming the setting of the listed buildings.	
442	Land north of Love Lane	Housing	Westleton	Westleton Parish Council	Against development of this site, access is via a single track unmade road and designated as a area to be protected from	Site is unavailable and therefore is not being taken forward.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					development.	
442	Land north of Love Lane	Housing	Westleton	Private individual	Site has been considered in the past and found unsuitable. Surrounded by housing and very limited access to the site.	
442	Land north of Love Lane	Housing	Westleton	Private individual	Site is completely unsuitable because of adverse impact on surrounding listed buildings, extreme contours, would lead to overlooking, impact on flora and fauna, dangerous access and inadequate service provisions.	
442	Land north of Love Lane	Housing	Westleton	Northland Ltd	Site is a designated area to be protected from development and no development potential.	
447	Land to the South East of Blythburgh Road, Westleton	Housing	Westleton	Westleton Parish Council	Strongly oppose development on this site – excessive speeding, no footpath on the site of the road immediately south of the playing field would lead to dangerous situation for pedestrians which must be avoided.	Site not taken forward as a potential allocation, as the preferred site is considered to provide a more appropriate scale of development for the village.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
447	Land to the South East of Blythburgh Road, Westleton	Housing	Westleton	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site is in close proximity to Minsmere-Walberswick SPA, Minsmere-Walberswick Heaths SAC, Minsmere-Walberswick Ramsar site and Minsmere-Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SSSI. Further assessment is required to determine whether development in this location is likely to result in an adverse impact on these sites.	
447	Land to the South East of Blythburgh Road, Westleton	Housing	Westleton	Northland Ltd	Site immediately adjacent to Minsmere nature reserve which hosts a range of Ramsar, SAC, SPA and SSSI adjacent to the AONB.	
554	Land West of B1125	Housing and open space	Westleton	Private Individual	Land promoted for development	Site proposed for allocation in the First Draft Local Plan.
554	Land West of B1125	Housing and open space	Westleton	Westleton Parish Council	Oppose development on this site – speeding problem on the road	The comments have been considered in identifying preferred sites. Westleton is identified as a small village in the settlement hierarchy and is
554	Land West of B1125	Housing and open space	Westleton	Savills	Site promoted by the landowner for residential use.	
554	Land West of	Housing and open space	Westleton	Northland	Site immediately adjacent	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	B1125			Ltd	to the Special Landscape Area and would adversely affect its setting.	identified as having some potential for growth. Reflecting the comments, a speed limit extension, footway and crossing point are included within the policy requirements.
554	Land West of B1125	Housing and open space	Westleton	SCC Highways	Footway along Reckford road required. Potential 30 mph speed limit extension.	
877	Land to the rear of The Vicarage, Darsham Road	Housing	Westleton	Westleton Parish Council	Support development on this site, together with the Vicarage. Residents in the village have formed a community interest company which is negotiating to purchase the land from the church. Project is supported by the Parish Council.	Noted. Site not understood to not be available for allocation through the Local Plan and is therefore not identified as a potential site.
877	Land to the rear of The Vicarage, Darsham Road	Housing	Westleton	Northland Ltd	Poorly related to the setting of the listed church. Site is also on high ground with direct views to the listed buildings. Access would also be difficult.	
943	Land to rear of 2 - 8 Grangeview, Yoxford Road, Westleton	Housing	Westleton	Westleton Parish Council	We have no objection to this site. There is a covenant on the land specifically barring building work.	Comments reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for housing development.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
943	Land to rear of 2 - 8 Grangeview, Yoxford Road, Westleton	Housing	Westleton	Northland Ltd	Directly opposite grade 2 listed Grange and within the conservation area which would cause demonstrable harm to the heritage assets.	
7	Land adj to 14 and 16 The Crescent, Dallinghoo Road	Housing	Wickham Market	Private individual	Traffic flows, together with narrow minor rural roads with their 'pinch points' must be a constraint on most sites for development in Wickham Market.	An emerging neighbourhood plan is addressing preferred sites for new housing in Wickham Market.
499	Land West of Old School Farm, High Street, Wickham Market	Housing	Wickham Market	Hopkins Homes	Site promoted by the landowner for residential purposes.	An emerging neighbourhood plan is addressing preferred sites for new housing in Wickham Market.
499	Land West of Old School Farm, High Street, Wickham Market	Housing	Wickham Market	Private individual	Site is too large a development and not proportionate to existing village development. Would blur the separation between Wickham Market and Pettistree and be hugely detrimental to the village and its environment.	
499	Land West of Old School Farm, High Street,	Housing	Wickham Market	SCC Highways	Footway widening required along frontage plus potential improvements to	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Wickham Market				Walnuts lane towards school	
582	Land rear of Deben Court	Housing	Wickham Market	Private individual	Completely unsuitable, would lead to creation of a developed corridor linking towns of Ipswich and Felixstowe.	Site identified as unsuitable as it is not within, adjoining, adjacent or well related to the form of the settlement.
816	Land adj to Thong Hall, Thong Hall Road and South of Dallinghoo Road	Housing	Wickham Market	Private individual	Traffic flows, together with narrow minor rural roads with their 'pinch points' must be a constraint on most sites for development in Wickham Market.	An emerging neighbourhood plan is addressing preferred sites for new housing in Wickham Market.
816	Land adj to Thong Hall, Thong Hall Road and South of Dallinghoo Road	Housing	Wickham Market	SCC Highways	Significant length of footway required on Dallinghoo Road. Potentially also widening of road and speed limit reduction.	
878	Land off Yew Tree Rise	Housing	Wickham Market	SCC Highways	Not confident that Yew Tree Rise could accommodate this level of development traffic. Spring Lane is too narrow without footways.	An emerging neighbourhood plan is addressing preferred sites for new housing in Wickham Market.
1055	Land adj. Gelham Hall, North of	Housing	Wickham Market	Private individual	Traffic flows, together with narrow minor rural roads with their 'pinch points'	An emerging neighbourhood plan is addressing preferred

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Dallinghoo Road, Wickham Market				must be a constraint on most sites for development in Wickham Market.	sites for new housing in Wickham Market.
1055	Land adj. Gelham Hall, North of Dallinghoo Road, Wickham Market	Housing	Wickham Market	SCC Highways	Significant length of footway required on Dallinghoo Road. Potentially also widening of road and speed limit reduction.	
305	Land north of Three Corners, B1077	Housing	Witnesham	Swilland & Witnesham Grouped Parish Council	Do not support allocation, remote from village.	Site not taken forward as below the site size threshold.
491	Land opposite Burwash Cottages Main Road, Witnesham	Housing	Witnesham	Swilland & Witnesham Grouped Parish Council	Refuse – dismissed at appeal.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
555	Land off Sandy Lane	Housing	Witnesham	Swilland & Witnesham Grouped	Did not support, application withdrawn. Access issue	Comments noted. Alternative sites selected in Witnesham.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
				Parish Council		
555	Land off Sandy Lane	Housing	Witnesham	Landbridge	Site promoted by the landowner for residential use..	
774	Land at Mow Hill, Witnesham	Housing	Witnesham	Swilland & Witnesham Grouped Parish Council	Support development of this site, along with adjacent area 775.	Support noted. Part of the site has been identified as a preferred site. Witnesham is a small village in the settlement hierarchy and has some potential for growth.
775	Land at Mow Hill, Witnesham	Housing	Witnesham	Swilland & Witnesham Grouped Parish Council	Support development of this site, along with adjacent area 774.	Support noted. Part of the site has been identified as a preferred site. Witnesham is a small village in the settlement hierarchy and has some potential for growth.
995	Land to the south of Primary School, Witnesham	Housing	Witnesham	Swilland & Witnesham Grouped Parish Council	Allocation supported, may not be deliverable because of access issues.	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
						to the form of the settlement.
1049	Land at and surrounding Greenway, Hall Lane	Housing	Witnesham	Swiland & Witnesham Grouped Parish Council	Flooding issue.	The site is not made available for consideration in this Local Plan.
373	Land at Wyevale Garden Centre, Grundisburgh Road	Housing	Woodbridge	Private individual	Any further housing development on the outskirts of Woodbridge would adversely affect those currently living in Woodbridge and tourists wishing to visit the town. To maintain the vibrancy of the town and the economic viability of retailers, and to encourage tourism, it is essential that parking needs are catered for.	Comments noted. Site identified as unavailable in Draft SHELAA.
373	Land at Wyevale Garden Centre, Grundisburgh Road	Housing	Woodbridge	Woodbridge Town Council	WTC is happy for small scale development west of the A12 provided it is low density. Any large scale development here should not be permitted.	
373	Land at Wyevale Garden Centre, Grundisburgh	Housing	Woodbridge	Woodbridge Society	As sites 373 and 514 are already developed, albeit not for housing, we would	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	Road				not object in principle to their development for housing, provided that the existing activities are not displaced to other sites beyond the A12.	
373	Land at Wyvale Garden Centre, Grundisburgh Road	Housing	Woodbridge	SCC Highways	Nearest crossing facility on A12 is some distance from site, feasibility of additional crossing would need to be investigated	
486	Queen's House, Woodbridge	Housing	Woodbridge	Seckford Foundation	Land promoted for development.	Noted that site has planning permission.
486	Queen's House, Woodbridge	Housing	Woodbridge	Private individual	Any further housing development on the outskirts of Woodbridge would adversely affect those currently living in Woodbridge and tourists wishing to visit the town. To maintain the vibrancy of the town and the economic viability of retailers, and to encourage tourism, it is essential that parking needs are catered for.	Planning permission for 6 homes (DC/16/4008/FUL).
486	Queen's House, Woodbridge	Housing	Woodbridge	Woodbridge Town Council	Agreed as it is in the boundary of the town and sustainable within the true	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					sense of the word	
486	Queen's House, Woodbridge	Housing	Woodbridge	Woodbridge Society	Already been agreed as suitable for housing.	
510	Toller's Field, Woodbridge School, IP12 4JW	Housing	Woodbridge	Private individual	Any further housing development on the outskirts of Woodbridge would adversely affect those currently living in Woodbridge and tourists wishing to visit the town. To maintain the vibrancy of the town and the economic viability of retailers, and to encourage tourism, it is essential that parking needs are catered for.	Comments noted. It is not demonstrated that the site is surplus to education or playing field needs or that alternative provision is demonstrated. The site is within physical development limits so this policy is applicable to any planning application.
510	Toller's Field, Woodbridge School, IP12 4JW	Housing	Woodbridge	Woodbridge Town Council	Agreed as it is in the boundary of the town and sustainable within the true sense of the word	
510	Toller's Field, Woodbridge School, IP12 4JW	Housing	Woodbridge	Woodbridge Society	If developed presumably an alternative site for a playing field will be required	
510	Toller's Field, Woodbridge School, IP12 4JW	Housing	Woodbridge	The Seckford Foundation	Site promoted by landowner for residential development.	
510	Toller's Field, Woodbridge School, IP12 4JW	Housing	Woodbridge	SCC Highways	No comments - within existing urban/residential setting.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
513	Land at Saddlemaker's Lane, Woodbridge, IP13 6AA	Housing	Woodbridge	SCC Highways	Direct access onto A12 may be required. May impact upon Melton crossroads without mitigation or improvement to junction	The site has been identified as not suitable through the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as it is not within, adjoining or well related to the form of the settlement.
514	Land at Grundisburgh Road, Woodbridge, IP13 6HX	Housing	Woodbridge	Private individual	Any further housing development on the outskirts of Woodbridge would adversely affect those currently living in Woodbridge and tourists wishing to visit the town. To maintain the vibrancy of the town and the economic viability of retailers, and to encourage tourism, it is essential that parking needs are catered for.	Comments noted. The strategy for the Local Plan does not focus on growth in Woodbridge.
514	Land at Grundisburgh Road, Woodbridge, IP13 6HX	Housing	Woodbridge	Woodbridge Town Council	WTC is happy for small scale development west of the A12 provided it is low density. Any large scale development here should	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					not be permitted.	
514	Land at Grundisburgh Road, Woodbridge, IP13 6HX	Housing	Woodbridge	Woodbridge Society	As sites 373 and 514 are already developed, albeit not for housing, we would not object in principle to their development for housing, provided that the existing activities are not displaced to other sites beyond the A12.	
514	Land at Grundisburgh Road, Woodbridge, IP13 6HX	Housing	Woodbridge	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	The site has no specific constraints to delivery and is immediately adjoining the existing urban area.	
514	Land at Grundisburgh Road, Woodbridge, IP13 6HX	Housing	Woodbridge	Trustee of the Conveyance for Scarfe Trustees	Site promoted by the landowner for housing, open space and retail uses for up to 5 units.	
551	Land West of The A12	Housing/Retail/Office/Education/Leisure	Woodbridge / Hasketon	Savills	Land promoted for development. Amendment to site area.	Amendment to site area has been made. The strategy for the Local Plan does not focus on growth in Woodbridge.
551	Land West of The A12	Housing/Retail/Office/Education/Leisure	Woodbridge	Private individual	Any further housing development on the outskirts of Woodbridge would adversely affect	The strategy for the Local Plan does not focus on growth in Woodbridge.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					those currently living in Woodbridge and tourists wishing to visit the town. To maintain the vibrancy of the town and the economic viability of retailers, and to encourage tourism, it is essential that parking needs are catered for.	
551	Land West of The A12	Housing/Retail/Office/Education/Leisure	Woodbridge	Woodbridge Town Council	We agree this can be developed for education and leisure or employment, but do not wish to see any retail as we need to protect the shopping experience in Woodbridge. We also do not wish to see any housing.	
551	Land West of The A12	Housing/Retail/Office/Education/Leisure	Woodbridge	Woodbridge Society	If developed presumably an alternative site for a playing field will be required.	
551	Land West of The A12	Housing/Retail/Office/Education/Leisure	Woodbridge	Savills	Site provides a sustainable extension to the west of Woodbridge to provide much needed housing with the opportunity to incorporate community uses and significant open space.	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
551	Land West of The A12	Housing/Retail/Office/Education/Leisure	Woodbridge	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Site includes Blunt's Wood Meadow CWS and development would therefore result in a loss of CWS.	
551	Land West of The A12	Housing/Retail/Office/Education/Leisure	Woodbridge	Private individual	Large mixed-use area 551 is too much for transport infrastructure and may cause surface water run-off problems in low-lying parts of Woodbridge.	
551	Land West of The A12	Housing/Retail/Office/Education/Leisure	Woodbridge	SCC Highways	Accesses onto A12 and/or B1079 (with improvement). Sustainable links to Woodbridge across A12 required.	
22	The Pig Farm, Middleton Road	Housing	Yoxford	EDF Energy	EDF Energy is considering its options for improving the A12/B1122 junction and requests that land be allocated for the junction improvement proposals as part of any allocation.	Comments and infrastructure and landscape information reflected in the site not being proposed for allocation for new housing. Site is not made available for consideration in the First Draft Local Plan.
22	The Pig Farm, Middleton Road	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Developing the site could provide needed accommodation but consideration should be given to the possibility of flooding and lack of safe	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					crossing provision across the A12.	
22	The Pig Farm, Middleton Road	Housing	Yoxford	SCC Highways	Access from B1122. New footway required on northern side of B1122	
66	land to the rear of Field End, Little Street	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Road is too narrow for two large vehicles to pass one another. Sewers are smelly and may well need work if it has to carry more waste.	Comments noted. The site is not made available for consideration for development in the First Draft Local Plan.
66	land to the rear of Field End, Little Street	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Plot 66 has been developed and this map does not reflect the current situation	
76	Land adj to Toad End, Little Street	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Any development here would be dangerous with regards to road users. The road is narrow and this plot is on the approach to a hill. Sewers and drains do not cope with current levels of development	Comments noted. The site is not made available for consideration for development in the First Draft Local Plan.
76	Land adj to Toad End, Little Street	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Any development here would be dangerous with regards to road users. The road is narrow and this plot is on the approach to a hill. Sewers and drains do not cope with current levels of development	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
166	Land adj Clematis Cottage, Little Street	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Road is too narrow for two large vehicles to pass one another. Sewers are smelly and may well need work if it has to carry more waste.	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation reflecting flood risk and availability information and below site size threshold of 0.2ha.
166	Land adj Clematis Cottage, Little Street	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Site floods annually and any development could displace this flooding to neighbouring developments. Poor drains and sewers would be further compromised	
166	Land adj Clematis Cottage, Little Street	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Site should not be developed. They have both flooded in recent memory	
167	Land opposite The Hollies, Little Street	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Road is too narrow for two large vehicles to pass one another. Sewers are smelly and may well need work if it has to carry more waste.	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation reflecting flood risk and landscape evidence.
167	Land opposite The Hollies, Little Street	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Site floods annually and any development could displace this flooding to neighbouring developments. Poor drains and sewers would be further compromised	
167	Land opposite	Housing	Yoxford	Private	Site should not be	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
	The Hollies, Little Street			individual	developed. They have both flooded in recent memory	
441	land west of Cullcott Close	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Allowing development on sites 441 or 454 could set a dangerous precedent with regards to use of historic parkland. A large development would also upset the integrity and character of the village	Site not proposed for allocation reflecting environmental impact concerns bordering the Historic Parkland to the north.
441	land west of Cullcott Close	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Site 441 is also likely to be outside the village boundary and likely to be on a Historic Parkland site included in SPG6 Historic parks and gardens. For those reasons the site should not be developed	
454	Land West of Old High Road, Yoxford	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Allowing development on sites 441 or 454 could set a dangerous precedent with regards to use of historic parkland. A large development would also upset the integrity and character of the village	Comments noted. Site not proposed for allocation for development. Development of the site would result in loss of Historic Park and Garden which is considered inappropriate.
454	Land West of Old High Road, Yoxford	Housing	Yoxford	Private individual	Site 454 is also likely to be outside the village boundary and likely to be	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comment been addressed
					on a Historic Parkland site included in SPG6 Historic parks and gardens. For those reasons the site should not be developed	

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish / Town	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comments been addressed
-------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	--------------	----------	--

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish / Town	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comments been addressed
N/A	Land to the rear of Rose Hill (existing allocation SSP3)	Housing	Aldeburgh	Aldeburgh Town Council	Support for this site being developed.	Comment noted. Site allocations from the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD have been carried over.
Q144 – Are there any other sites you are aware of which the Council should consider?						
N/A	North Sea Hotel	Not specified	Felixstowe	Felixstowe Town Council	North Sea Hotel site	The site has not been promoted as sites by landowners through the Local Plan. The policies within the plan would support development on these sites in principle if it were to come forward.
N/A	Convalescent Hill Car Park	Not specified	Felixstowe	Felixstowe Town Council	Convalescent Hill Car Park and surrounding area	The site has not been promoted as sites by landowners through the Local Plan. The policies within the plan would support development on these sites in principle if it were to come forward.
N/A	Woodbridge Airbase	Not specified	Sutton	Private Individual	Woodbridge air base should be added to potential sites list as it has facilities and is a brownfield site.	The airbase has not been promoted for consideration through the Local Plan by the landowner.
N/A	Langley Avenue playing field	Not specified	Felixstowe	Felixstowe Town Council	Langley Avenue playing field should be earmarked for cemetery expansion if at any time it is no longer required for its current use.	Comment noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Framework refers to increased cemetery provision across the District. It would need to be demonstrated that the playing field is no longer required or can be relocated for the land to be considered suitable for cemetery provision.
N/A	N/A	N/A	Hollesley	Private individual	The old officers club at Oak Hill, Hollesley should be looked at as a potential	As previously developed land this could be reused for appropriate uses subject to availability and promotion by the landowner.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish / Town	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comments been addressed
					building site.	
Summary of responses received under Questions 143 and 144 not related to specific sites						
Question 143 – Which sites do you consider appropriate for future consideration by the Council?						
Question 144 – Are there any other sites you are aware of which the Council should consider?						
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Private Individual	No sites should be considered for development	The Local Plan must plan to meet the identified housing need. Allocating sites enables a planning approach to be taken.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Private individual	Do not wish to have development of 10 dwellings in one place	The Local Plan identifies a range of site sizes for allocation. Development on larger sites enables infrastructure and affordable housing provision.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Private Individual	Sites should exclude areas covered by TPOs	Impacts on TPOs have been considered through the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal process and references to protecting these incorporated into site allocations policies where necessary,
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Marlesford Parish Council	Marlesford is not suitable for new housing allocations.	Marlesford is identified as within the countryside in the settlement hierarchy and therefore it is not appropriate to allocate sites in Marlesford.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Felixstowe Town Council	Total from sites 625, 644, 800, 801, 802, 941, 1091 would be 1340 which should be considered with potential contribution from Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary.	The strategy includes development of up to 2,000 dwellings at North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood, as delivering a comprehensive approach to leisure led development to the north of Felixstowe.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Suffolk	All sites should be	Impacts on landscape and heritage have

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish / Town	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comments been addressed
				Preservation Society	assessed in accordance with their landscape and heritage impact, together with proportionality to host settlement.	been considered through the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal process.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Private Individual	Development should be kept to the west of the A12 to avoid impacts on environmental designations.	Potential impacts on environmental designations have been considered through the SHELAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Private Individuals	Brownfield sites should be considered first	The sustainability Appraisal has considered whether a site would result in loss of agricultural land, however as a largely rural District there are relatively few brownfield opportunities.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB	Proposals for major development within the AONB should be resisted. Development affecting the setting of the AONB or close to protected sites should also be avoided.	Impacts on the AONB and other designations have been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal and policy requirements incorporated where necessary.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Private Individual	Sites should be developed on the	The strategy for the Local Plan focuses growth on the A12 corridor.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish / Town	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comments been addressed
					A12/A14 corridors.	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Private Individual	Appropriate sites for consideration include East of Ipswich parishes, Rushmere St Andrew, Kesgrave, Felixstowe, Woodbridge, Aldeburgh, Framlingham, Leiston and Saxmundham.	Noted. The strategy focuses on Felixstowe and Saxmundham, and it is noted that other urban areas have received development over recent years.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Bromeswell Parish Council	Sites in Felixstowe, the Trimleys, Nacton, Rushmere, Kesgrave, Foxhall and Martlesham should be priorities for development due to proximity to A14 corridor.	The proposed strategy focuses on Felixstowe, Saxmundham, the A12 and rural areas. It is acknowledged that growth in the east Ipswich area will largely come forward through the Brightwell Lakes development over the plan period.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Historic England	Refer to comments provided through Felixstowe Area Action Plan.	Consideration of impacts on the historic environment has formed part of the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal process.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Private Individual	There should be a presumption against development on a site unless the Town	Comments from Town and Parish Councils have been considered along with other factors when selecting proposed sites for allocation.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish / Town	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comments been addressed
					or Parish Council are supportive.	
N/A	N/A	N/A	Blythburgh	Blythburgh Parish Council	The maps do not show recent developments or permissions. Any new development in Blythburgh should satisfy the needs of the community, be of exceptional quality and balance the building stock.	Noted. The maps only show potential sites for consideration for allocation in the new Local Plan for clarity as comments were only being invited on those sites. Design policies are contained in the new Local Plan.
N/A	N/A	N/A	Framlingham	Historic England	Great care should be taken in Framlingham, also in terms of cumulative effects.	The Local Plan does not propose any sites in Framlingham, and provides an opportunity for a review of the Neighbourhood Plan to identify sites.
N/A	N/A	N/A	Hacheston	Private individual	Should be no more than 10 additional dwellings allocated for Hacheston – lack of services and facilities	No allocations are proposed in Hacheston.
N/A	N/A	N/A	Hollesley	Private individual	Development in Hollesley should be kept to a minimum due to distance needed to travel to places of	Noted, however Hollesley is identified as a Large Village.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish / Town	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comments been addressed
					employment.	
N/A	N/A	N/A	Kelsale cum Carlton	Private Individual	Sites should not be developed in Kelsale as this will have impacts in relation to the village character and transport. There is no shop. Some sites are no available.	The Local Plan identifies the Neighbourhood Plan as being the mechanism to identify land for housing. Availability checks have been undertaken and unavailable sites not progressed any further.
N/A	N/A	N/A	Kelsale cum Carlton	Kelsale cum Carlton Parish Council	Neighbourhood Plan considering sites.	Noted. The Local Plan policy SCLP12.1 sets out the approach to designated Neighbourhood Plan areas.
N/A	N/A	N/A	Saxmundham	Private individual	No sites in Saxmundham should be developed due to impacts on infrastructure.	Noted, however strategic scale growth at South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood will enable the delivery of a new school. Health provision in Saxmundham is identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Framework.
N/A	N/A	N/A	Westerfield	Westerfield Parish Council	Westerfield has had a large amount of development recently and should not therefore have further development. Should there be any further development Westerfield would benefit from a shop.	There are no new sites proposed for allocation in Westerfield, however existing allocation to the south of Lower Road is carried forward.

Site Number	Site Name	Proposed use	Parish / Town	Submitted by	Comments	How have these comments been addressed
N/A	N/A	N/A	Wickham Market	Wickham Market Parish Council	Wickham Market Neighbourhood Plan committee are currently identifying potential suitable development sites.	Noted. The Local Plan policy SCLP12.1 sets out the approach to designated Neighbourhood Plan areas.
N/A	N/A	N/A	Yoxford	Yoxford Parish Council	Support some development in Yoxford but concerned about larger developments. If larger development enabled provision of a new village hall this may be supported.	No sites have been identified as preferred sites in Yoxford, and of those which were identified as suitable they may not be of sufficient size to accommodate a village hall.

ENDS