



Suffolk Coastal District Council

## Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document

Analysis of Responses to the Preferred Options Consultation Period

19 October 2015 – 30 November 2015

April 2016

# Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Preferred Options Stage

## Analysis of Responses to the Consultation 19 October 2015 – 30 November 2015

The Council applied publicity and engagement methods outlined in its 2014 Statement of Community Involvement. The Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Preferred Options Document was publicised and consulted upon alongside a Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Preferred Options document.

### **Publicity methods and material**

The Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Preferred Options Consultation Document together with a response form, was made available at the Council's main office, in local libraries and on the District Council's website from 19 October 2015. A supporting press release on the consultation was issued on the same date for inclusion in local media. The Autumn 2015 edition of the Council's Coastline newsletter, distributed to all households in the district, contained an article on the consultation. On 16 October 2015 copies were distributed to district councillors, parish and town councils, residents, businesses, representatives of the development industry, environment groups and other interested contacts listed in a dedicated up-to-date Council consultation list for planning policy documents. Public notices were displayed in visible locations at those sites preferred for new housing in the consultation documents. These approaches were supplemented by use of social media and involving parish and town councils who additionally were requested to advertise the Preferred Options consultation on parish noticeboards and in local community leaflets and newsletters.

The following documents were made available and distributed alongside the consultation documents. These documents supported the content of the consultation documents.

- Interim Sustainability Appraisal report (October 2015);
- Habitats Regulations Report (October 2015);
- Analysis of how the earlier responses to the earlier Issues and Options consultation comments have been addressed in the Preferred Options document (October 2015).

A drop in event specifically for District Councillors on both Preferred Options documents has held on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2015, early in the public consultation period.

## Public engagement

A programme of public drop in sessions were held on the Preferred Options documents, during the consultation period. These were held between 4pm and 8pm on weekdays in 5 towns and villages across that part of the district to which the document relates. The events were open to anybody interested in attending without any need for prior arrangement for the purpose of generating feedback on the preferred planning policies and sites earmarked for development and conservation in the document. Each 'drop-in' event enabled local residents to obtain information, ask questions and discuss ideas relating to any part of the district. Further sessions were held at other locations within the Felixstowe Peninsula during the consultation period which focussed on the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Event Venue	Date of Session	Approximate Number of Attendees
Riverside Centre, Stratford St Andrew	02/11/2015	35
Orford Town Hall	05/11/2015	2
Rendlesham Community Centre	09/11/2015	40
Dennington Village Hall	10/11/2015	10
Westerfield Village Hall	11/11/2015	27

Consultation response forms were made available at the public open-door events and an online form made available on the council's website. Responses were also welcomed by email and letter.

During and outside the consultation period, the council engaged with infrastructure bodies, government agencies, developers and parish councils to address particular issues around the document. The Council has also been holding a Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Working Group alongside the plan making process. The Working Group, which consists of 16 district, parish and town council representatives, acts as sounding board, and provides input into the preparation of the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Document. The Working Group is a consultative rather than decision making body and the key points from the meetings are published on the Council's website. A similar working group provides input into the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

The public open-door events, publication and engagement undertaken generated a lot of feedback to the consultation documents. The Council received 576 separate comments from 239 different respondents for the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document and a further 574 separate comments from 209 different respondents for the Felixstowe Peninsula AAP. Responses were received from residents, businesses, developers, parish and town councils and public bodies.

The following pages provide a summary of each individual representation received in respect of the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Preferred Options Document. The comments are presented in the order of sections of the Preferred Options document. Against each representation is a summary of the comments made, the Council's response to the comments and how these are being reflected in the document as it progresses to its next stage. The iterative nature of preparing and editing the two consultation documents concurrently means that the wording in future versions of the documents may not be exactly the same as proposed under the Council's response.

The consultation helped inform further changes identified by council officers which are detailed in the table below.

<b>Other Officer Recommended Changes to the Site Allocations - Preferred Options</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Need to make a clear commitment in the plan to an early review	To align with the need to review the Core Strategy and address the full objectively assessed housing need and, to ensure an adequate supply of land across the current plan period and beyond
Include a housing trajectory in the plan	To demonstrate how the housing requirement will contribute to the rolling 5 year supply and be delivered across the plan period
Make reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy being in place	For clarity
Include a Monitoring Framework	A requirement to demonstrate how the plan will be monitored
Include a Delivery Framework	A requirement to demonstrate how the plan will be delivered
Align introduction to the Plan with the introduction for the Felixstowe Peninsula AAP	For consistency
Align the Areas to Protect from Development Site Allocations policy SSP35 and the similar AAP policy FPP26	For clarity and consistency across the District
Text in policies to read “development of the site will be in accordance with the following criteria...”	Preferred Options used “applicants should have regard to...” but this is considered too weak
Amend policy wording to read “Approximately xxx units...”	Preferred Options used “minimum” but this is considered to be too restrictive and may be difficult to implement / enforce.
Amend Site Allocations policies to read “Policy SSP....” Site Allocations used “Preferred Option” whilst the AAP used “Preferred Policy.”	Use “Policy” for consistency.
Make recommended changes to policies In response to the HRA for the preferred options document.	To mitigate potential impacts of growth and development on nature conservation sites of European significance (European sites)
Remove Policy Maps for Bredfield and Wenhaston	These two parishes are preparing Neighbourhood Plans
Other minor text, policy and map changes	For clarity and consistency

# Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Preferred Options

## Public Participation Report

Introduction

1.01

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<h3>Introduction</h3>				
1.01				
6582 - Mr Kenneth Sycamore [3708]	Comment	More public transport and street lighting required	<p>The site allocations documents provide more detailed information on where future development will be concentrated, thereby providing evidence to inform discussions and decisions on future investment in public transport.</p> <p>The provision of street lighting is not a matter for the site allocations documents. The extent to which the presence or lack of street lighting is a material consideration in the determination of an individual planning application is a matter for the development management process.</p>	On-going discussions with Suffolk County Council to identify key transport routes to which investment, including CIL funding can be put.
7288 - Leiston Land Ltd/Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [3946]	Comment	Agrees documents should avoid unnecessary repetition of policy advice but considers that high level documents such as the SCSAAP should identify key strategic sites such as 'land to the rear of St Margaret's Crescent, Leiston' and provide the broad parameters within which development should take place. The neighbourhood plans should then provide additional information setting out more clearly the issues and constraints associated with each site.	The high level document for both the Site Allocations Document and the neighbourhood plans is the Core Strategy. The Site Allocations Document provides a further breakdown in terms of housing numbers in SSP1 which the neighbourhood plans will be required to provide. How the numbers are achieved within a neighbourhood plan area is down to consultation through that plan process.	No change
7211 - Hatcheston Parish Council (Mr Bartholomew Hall) [3513]	Comment	Consultation period too short. The document uses difficult language which takes time to study and understand.	<p>Parish Councils were pre-notified of the consultation. It is for individual parish / town councils to decide whether or not there is a need to call an extra meeting to consider their response to a particular consultation.</p> <p>Wording will be re-checked with a view to aiding clarity and understanding.</p>	Check plan for use of plain english.
<p><i>More use of plain english.</i></p>				

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6581 - Mr Rhodri Griffiths [3707]	Comment	More evidence is required to demonstrate that partnership working is securing additional public and community transport provision.	This quote is from the Vision section in the Core Strategy. The role of the site allocations document is to implement policies and proposals in the Core Strategy. The site allocations documents identify more specifically where future development is to be concentrated thereby providing the more detailed evidence with which to inform discussions and decisions on where public transport provision should be concentrated and investment committed. Service providers are the County Council and the public transport companies.	Continue discussions with Suffolk County Council with a view to seeking agreement as to which are the key transport routes where investment should be concentrated and to which CIL funding could be provided.
<b>1.02</b>				
6789 - ONR (Tim Randles) [3772]	Comment	Saxmundham; Aldeburgh: and Aldringham cum Thorpe (Thorpeness) lie within the ONR's outer consultation zone around the Sizewell nuclear sites. I would request that ONR is consulted regarding the proposals within any neighbourhood plans that are taken forward relating to these areas. Notifications relating to such proposals should be directed to ONR.Land.Use.Planning@onr.gsi.gov.uk .	Comment noted	Update SCDC neighbourhood plan data base. Pass information to relevant town/parish councils for use in their neighbourhood plan work.
<b>1.05</b>				
7179 - Taylor Wimpey [2902]	Object	The early review of the Core Strategy as set out in Policy SP2 has not commenced. This review has not taken place and as such the Council is failing to comply with the requirement of paragraph 47 of the Framework	<p>The remit of the site allocations documents is to implement the policies in the Core Strategy. This means identifying sufficient housing sites to provide for at least the 7,900 new homes set out in Core Strategy policy SP2, thereby significantly boosting the supply of housing as envisaged by the Core Strategy Inspector.</p> <p>The review of the Local Plan will be a review of both the Core Strategy and the site allocations documents. The site allocations documents will be adopted by the end of 2016. Preparatory work has commenced on the Review in conjunction with neighbouring authorities. The latest timetable is set out in the 2015 Local Development Scheme. The review will provide an updated full objectively assessed housing need for Suffolk Coastal and the wider area.</p>	Include an additional paragraph in the introduction section of the site allocations documents regarding progress with the Local Plan review.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<b>1.06</b>				
6816 - RSPB (Jacqui Miller) [2839]	Comment	Re Adastral Park planning application at this stage, there cannot be confidence that the application and its associated green space provision will be realised. Therefore this project should not be relied upon to provide mitigation for recreational pressure on European sites through the provision of green space for the district as a whole	The paragraphs clearly state that the on-site open space is a "significant element" of the Core Strategy mitigation measures. It is linked to the strategic level of housing growth proposed at Martlesham. Other measures will be required linked to new housing development elsewhere in the district.	No change
6833 - Waldringfield Parish Council (Mr David Lines) [2859]	Object	Strategic planning documents should not make assumptions about the outcome of specific planning applications. Any community engagement by the applicants BT, in relation to C/09/0555, took place more than 6 years ago. Once the planning application is approved (if it is), it will be too late for meaningful community input	The Council has an adopted Core Strategy policy SP20 which provides the in principle agreement to major housing and employment development in this area. It also identifies specific requirements which any project scale development will need to meet. Opportunities for public consultation / involvement remain through the planning application and master plan processes. This is clearly set out in the plan.	No change
6832 - Waldringfield Parish Council (Mr David Lines) [2859]	Object	Changes have been made to SCDC's strategic housing allocations since 2009 when the Adastral Park planning application was submitted. In order to be compliant with the CS, C/09/0555 would have to be significantly modified. It is therefore not appropriate to refer to C/09/0555 in this context.	The Adastral Park planning application broadly accords with the strategic housing and employment growth proposed for this area south and east of Adastral Park under Core Strategy Policy SP20. Any planning application for this strategic level of growth will be required to comply with that policy and the requirements identified.	No change
<b>1.14</b>				
6801 - Mr David Beaumont [209]	Object	There is an ambiguity with regard to the status of remaining "saved" policies and at what point and by which document they will be superseded.	This Plan is required to list all the "saved" policies that are to be superseded or no longer required following the adoption of the Plan. This list will be provided in the Appendix to the Proposed Submission version of the Plan. There will be a few policies that remain to be superseded by Neighbourhood Plans. This list and the Neighbourhood Plans that will supersede them will be published on the Council's website at the appropriate time.	Include an Appendix in the Proposed Submission version of the Plan to clarify those "saved" policies to be superseded/replaced and publish on the Council's website, at the appropriate time, a list of those remaining policies to be superseded by Neighbourhood Plans.
<i>Change requested "All areas of land currently identified in the Core Strategy under "Saved" policies and that are destined to be devolved to Neighbourhood Plans will remain in force until such time that the appropriate Neighbourhood Plan has been completed and adopted."</i>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>1.15</i>	6749 - Mrs Wendy Mannall [3787] Comment	Consultations should be better advertised in order to engage far more of the population whose lives maybe affected one way or another by the decisions made.	The Council will review its consultation arrangements to see what other efficient and cost effective measures can be taken to advertise its documents more widely.	Review existing consultation arrangements and their effectiveness.
<i>1.16</i>	7180 - Taylor Wimpey [2902] Object	In the absence of an up-to-date OAN figure the Evidence Base is not robust. There is no reference to updated information on housing need and no consideration appears to have been given to what the Council intends to do once an updated review of the OAN has been undertaken.	The remit of the site allocations documents is to identify sufficient housing land to meet the housing requirement in the adopted Core Strategy SP2. It will be for the Local Plan review to update the full objectively assessed housing need for the district from that set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Preparatory work on the Local Plan review has commenced jointly with other neighbouring authorities. A timetable for the review is set out in the Council's 2015 Local Development Scheme.	Include an additional paragraph in the introduction section of the site allocations documents regarding progress with the Local Plan review.
<i>1.17</i>	6750 - Mrs Wendy Mannall [3787] Comment	<p>How do The Working Group arrive at the content of their input?</p> <p>Do they consult with the residents of the towns and parishes?</p> <p>Or are the views expressed largely an assumption of what would be deemed favourable?</p>	The Working Group comprises a mix of parish/town councils and District Councillors to assist in the preparation of the the Plan. They provide a cross section of views and are a consultative group, not decision making body, with decisions resting with the District Council through the formal committee processes. They act as a sounding board for the local community and provide input on local issues, the format, style and content of the Local Plan documents. They also provide input on consultation methods and tools appropriate to the area. The input of the Working Group is considered alongside the feedback from public consultations.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.18</b>	6707 - Mrs Margaret Blakeney [3085]	Comment Middleton PC did not arrange public meetings or visits on the doorstep. SCDC received the views of the Parish Council Chairman, without any consultation. Several individuals did write to SCDC but the process lacked any interactive discussion between residents.	Concerns relating to engagement and the response from the parish council need to be taken up with the parish council. The District Council carefully considers all the representations received whether from the parish council or individuals and provides a response. Unfortunately, the Council does not usually have the resources to engage directly with all individuals on a one to one basis. The issues raised relating to an aging population, affordable housing and second homes are acknowledged. The Council cannot control second homes through planning policies but policies in the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations plan seek to address the needs of an aging population and those seeking affordable housing by requiring a mix of house types and tenures on sites for development and when making decisions on planning applications.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>	
<b>1.26</b>	7714 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [2605]	Comment	<p>A number of the policies in the draft AAP have negative scores for the biodiversity Sustainability Appraisal indicator (indicator 17). It is unclear how this will be addressed and a plan should not be put forward which results in an overall negative impact on biodiversity, as such this would not be in conformity with the NPPF. For example policy FPP2 scores negatively on the environmental Sustainability Appraisal criteria and it is unclear how allocation of this site would address this.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 110 of the NPPF requires that plans should aim to minimise adverse effects on the local and natural environment and should allocate land with the least environmental value.</i></p> <p><i>It is also noted that the draft AAP proposes the allocation of sites in Walton; Trimley St Mary and Trimley St Martin. A number of these sites have previously had ecological surveys carried out on them as part of planning applications which has identified that they have biodiversity value. It is unclear how the policies which are proposed to allocate these sites address this issue. It is also unclear whether the cumulative impact of developing all the proposed sites has been assessed.</i></p> <p><i>In accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 110) only land with the least environmental value should be allocated.</i></p>	Comments noted	Where appropriate measures of mitigation or the requirement for further studies to be added to the document and site specific policies as necessary.
<b>1.29</b>	7210 - Hacheston Parish Council (Mr Bartholomew Hall) [3513]	Comment	<p>SA criteria 7, 8 and 23 that recognise the need to meet the housing requirements of the whole community and encourage community participation and inward investment into the District are supported.</p>	Support noted	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7188 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club [3914]	Support	Additional policy required (section 2 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club housing with extra care scheme/redevelopment of Clarke Demolition Company site to enable relocation of the business) . My client supports the current wording and specifically criteria 7, 8 and 23 that recognise the need to meet the housing requirements of the whole community and encourage community participation and inward investment into the District.	Support for Sustainability Appraisal objectives 7, 8 and 23 noted.	No change
1.30	Comment	7345 - Natural England (Sir/Madam) [2516]	References to mitigation for 'in combination' effects of new housing proposed in section 3.3.3 and to a Green infrastructure plan area noted. However, inline with current advice, this is not sufficient to give confidence that the required mitigation measures will be delivered. Additional commitment is required to having a mitigation strategy in place, informed by the green infrastructure plan, ideally by the time the plan is adopted or by a specified timescale shortly after the plan is adopted. This is necessary to give certainty that the mitigation measures will be delivered to ensure the plan is compliant with the Habitats Regulations and with paragraphs 113 and 118 of the NPPF. <i>We therefore suggest the following rewording: 'The Council will produce a mitigation strategy by {INSERT DATE} which will specify the measures required and how these will be delivered and funded'</i>	Comment noted and amendment proposed as suggested. The Council has embarked on the production of a mitigation strategy under the "duty to co-operate". The date to complete of March 2017 reflects discussions with Ipswich BC, Babergh DC and SCC, as informed by Natural England.  Add: New sentence at end of paragraph 1.32 to clarify that the Council will produce a recreational and avoidance mitigation strategy by March 2017 which will specify the measures required and how these will be delivered and funded.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

1.32

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7712 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [2605]	Comment	<p>The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Site Allocations Preferred Options identifies further work that is required to assess the impacts of several parts of the plan on sites of European nature conservation importance. Such assessment should be undertaken prior to the council's Preferred Options being progressed in order to determine whether they are likely to result in significant adverse effects on such nature conservation sites.</p> <p>The HRA report discounts potential impacts from a number of the proposed sites as they are perceived to be outside of walking distance from a European designated site. However, the study does not appear to take account of travel by car from new developments to European designated sites. Prior to the allocation of any new development sites this factor must be addressed to ensure that development of allocated sites, both alone and in-combination, is not likely to result in adverse impacts on any European designated sites. Unless this matter is adequately addressed we do not consider that the plan can be demonstrated to be 'sound'.</p> <p>The HRA of the Council's adopted Core Strategy DPD also identified a number of measures which were required in order to prevent increased recreational pressure from resulting in a likely significant effect on sites of European nature conservation importance. It should therefore be ensured that these measures are incorporated in to the Site Allocations and Felixstowe AAP documents, with the impacts of the proposals within these documents then assessed. Accordingly. If you require any further information or wish to discuss any of the points raised above please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p><i>However, the study does not appear to take account of travel by car from new developments to European designated sites. Prior to the allocation of any new development sites this factor must be addressed to ensure that development of allocated sites, both alone and in-combination, is not likely to result in adverse impacts on any European designated sites. Unless this matter is adequately addressed we do not consider that the plan can be demonstrated to be 'sound'.</i></p>	<p>The mitigation strategy, in part, relies on the locational dependent, provision and restriction of parking availability to influence peoples walking behaviours - regardless of how far people may have driven. The prospect of walking at least 1 km to access the SPA, coupled with alternative parking provided elsewhere, has been found to dissuade people from doing so.</p> <p>In consultation with Natural England, a Memorandum of Understanding has been produced between Ipswich Borough Council, SCDC and Babergh District Councils to the affect that HRA mitigation will be covered in the 'Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy' to be complete by March 2017. Where relevant, reference to the requirement for an HRA assessment is now included against individual policies.</p>	<p>Additional references to mitigation now included within a revised Introduction and elsewhere through the plan</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
		<p><i>The HRA of the Council's adopted Core Strategy DPD also identified a number of measures which were required in order to prevent increased recreational pressure from resulting in a likely significant effect on sites of European nature conservation importance. It should therefore be ensured that these measures are incorporated in to the Site Allocations and Felixstowe AAP documents, with the impacts of the proposals within these documents then assessed accordingly.</i></p> <p><i>If you require any further information or wish to discuss any of the points raised above please do not hesitate to contact us.</i></p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b>Housing</b>				
<b>2.01</b>				
6576 - Mr Stuart Carruthers [3703]	Object	<p>The Site Allocations Document is not allocating sufficient land to meet the identified full objectively assessed housing need of 11,000 not 7,900. The Council gave an undertaking to the Secretary of State that it would</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Include a policy on the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</li> <li>* Introduce a clear commitment to an early review of the Core Strategy to address full, objectively assessed housing needs;</li> <li>* Clarify that the full, objectively assessed housing need for the District in the plan period at this point is 11,000 new dwellings.</li> </ul>	<p>Each of these issues has been addressed and clarified in the adopted Core Strategy document paragraphs 3.22 - 3.34 and policy SP2. Policy SP1a provides the policy presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p>	Include an additional paragraph in the introduction section of the site allocations documents regarding progress with the Local Plan review.
7290 - Fletcher Barton Ltd (Mr William Barton) [3482] 7396 - Fletcher Barton Ltd (Mr William Barton) [3482]	Object	Insufficient sites are being allocated. The full objectively assessed need is for 11,000 homes the plan is only looking to allocate "at least 7,900 homes. If anything the objectively assessed need is likely to have increased since 2013.	<p>The role of the site allocations documents are to implement the policies in the adopted Core Strategy. The housing requirement in the Core Strategy is set out in policy SP2 is for "at least" 7,900 homes. This is being provided for through the Site Allocations Document, the Felixstowe Area Action Plan and the various neighbourhood plans. The reasons for providing for the lower figure were fully debated at the Core Strategy Examination and agreed by the Inspector who found the plan "sound".</p>	Include an additional paragraph in the introduction section of the site allocations documents regarding progress with the Local Plan review.
<b>2.02</b>				
7428 - Framlingham Town Council (Mrs Eileen Coe) [3557]	Comment	Table 1 contains mathematical errors. There is no further breakdown of this minimum housing requirement for the market towns that helps Framlingham to understand the residual requirement for the town.	<p>One minor error has been identified in Table 1 in relation to the S106 agreement which should read 1100.</p> <p>More detailed information in relation to the housing provision for Framlingham is set out in Table 2. Table 1 identifies the absolute minimum number of homes to be provided across the market towns. There is a need for the plan to identify land for "at least" this minimum figure.</p>	Tables to be updated and checked to ensure mathematically correct. Information to be presented in a simplified format.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7112 - Hopkins Homes [551] 7113 - Hopkins Homes [551]	Support	The Site Allocations Document should contain individual policies for large sites located within neighbourhood plan areas which are considered to be "strategic". Sites at Leiston and Woodbridge promoted by them are suggested as relevant examples.	<p>The strategic policies relating to the scale and distribution of new homes is provided in the Core Strategy under SP19 and related policies. Policy SSP1 sets out in more detail how this housing provision is to be apportioned to individual settlements identified as sustainable under Core Strategy Policy SP19 for the district excluding that area covered by the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan. SSP1 includes those settlements for which a neighbourhood plan is being prepared and sets out the minimum number of homes required to be provided.</p> <p>There is no suggestion that the housing numbers identified for each of these neighbourhood plan areas cannot be achieved.</p>	No change
<hr/>				
2.06				
7270 - Framlingham Residents Association (Mr Christopher Sharpe) [3940]	Object	<p>Object to the revised housing figure for Framlingham on the basis it puts an unfair and unsustainable new homes burden on the market towns and should not be adopted</p> <p>From March 2010 to March 2015 the number of new homes built in Framlingham has, per year, been at the maximum amount required</p> <p><i>The target number should revert to the previous consultation figure of 75 - 150 homes.</i></p>	<p>The housing figure for Framlingham has been adjusted in terms of how the overall level of provision should be made rather than overall numbers. The adjustment reflects the fact that the originally projected housing figure for Station Road was 140, but this has now reduced around 100.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7004 - Hopkins Homes (Mr Robert Eburne) [2704]	Object	<p>The proposed housing growth does not take any account of the need to review the Cores Strategy now to rectify the significant shortfall in planned housing identified 3 years ago. It is not acceptable to continue to plan for subnormal growth and fail to meet that low target</p> <p><i>Review housing supply in line with the current Objectively Assessed Housing Need and as promised in the text of the core strategy.</i></p> <p><i>Prepare a site allocations document which gives strategic direction to neighbourhood plans in line with the Objectively Assessed Need</i></p> <p><i>Prepare a site allocations document which genuinely boosts significantly the supply of housing in a sustainable way in line with national policy and to compensate for a legacy of development restraint</i></p>	<p>The role of the site allocations documents is to implement the policies in the adopted Core Strategy. The housing requirement in the adopted Core Strategy is "at least" 7,900 homes. The site allocations documents will provide for this. Early completion of these site allocations documents is required to boost the supply of housing in the district over the plan period.</p> <p>The Local Plan review is the appropriate vehicle through which an updated objectively assessed housing need wil be identified.</p>	No change
6678 - Martlesham Parish Council (Mrs Susan Robertson) [486]	Support	Support for Housing Delivery Requirements	Support noted.	No change

## 2.07

6668 - Mr Chris Norrington [3752]	Comment	<p>Peasenall needs to grow in order to sustain its current commercial facilities and in particular its school. Unplanned windfall on sites which might not be considered the best or most sensible locations is not the way to go. This is already happening in the Mill Road area.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No suitable sites have been identified for Peasenall. With regard to unplanned windfall, many settlements are in the same position in terms of planning applications being submitted and determined ahead of the site allocations document being adopted. The Council is duty bound to determine such applications provided it has sufficient information to do so. This is why it is important to progress the site allocations documents as quickly as the statutory process will allow.</p>	No sites allocated but amendments made to physical limits boundary
-----------------------------------	---------	---	---	--

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6872 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Support	I welcome the proposed figures for East of Ipswich as this confirms that no other development will be required within this location apart from small windfall sites	Support noted.	No change
2.08				
7123 - Swilland and Witnesham Parish Council (Sarah-Jayne Bailey) [3058]	Comment	The new housing allocation total figure in Table 2 for Witnesham is incorrect. It should reflect the total as set out in Policies SSP16 and SSP17  <i>Correct figures in Table 2</i>	Comments noted.	Amend and update Table 2 to show correct figures
6757 - Ufford Parish Council (Mrs Judi Hallett) [3285]	Comment	1. Page 21 - the 'Indicative Minimum Contribution figure should read 25 (based on the other figures in the table) 2. Page 21 - why is the development of 34 houses at Crown Nursery not shown in this table? 3. Page 144 - SHLAA Site Ref. 706 - Why does the commentary read 'preferred location for relocation of football and cricket grounds' when there has been no consultation with Ufford Parish Council or Ufford residents.  <i>1. Pg 21 Amend "Indicative Minimum Contribution" for Ufford to read 25</i>	1. The indicative figure should correctly read 23. 2. The planning permission for 31 units at Crown Nursery was granted after the base date for the plan which is 31st March 2015. See note on page 17 of the Preferred Options Document. 3. This comment is responded to in responses to comments on Appendix 3	Correct table pg 21 in respect of Ufford to read in column (D) 23
7429 - Framlingham Town Council (Mrs Eileen Coe) [3557]	Comment	In table 2 why doesn't the total minimum contribution for 2010-2027 add up to the 7900 as it does in table 1; what is the 6063-6363 indicative of in housing terms? Where are the other 1500 or so dwellings? Framlingham town council recognises the housing numbers that relate to Completions and Permissions etc., ie. those in columns A & B , but would like an explanation of the new housing allocation of 200, how was this number decided, what calculation method is used, how does it relate to site allocations ,etc	Table 2 only relates to that part of the district covered by the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Document and those town and parish areas for which a designated neighbourhood plan area has been identified. The remaining housing is provided for through the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.  A more detailed explanation is to be provided in the supporting text.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6760 - Wenhampton with Mells Hamlet Parish Council (Mr Richard Day) [3248]	Comment	<p>Agree that the three sites 733, 938a and 938b are removed from consideration in the plan in line with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and because Wenhampton is well in excess of its quota.</p> <p>We agree that in excess of 30 new builds will occur in the 15 year period, but would like it acknowledged that Wenhampton's quota in the Local plan remains at 10-20 dwellings and we are likely to be more than double even the top end.</p> <p>The Parish Council's philosophy will be to develop infill plots within the settlement boundary in line with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Support and comment noted.	No change
6834 - Waldringfield Parish Council (Mr David Lines) [2859]	Comment	<p>Why have figures in Table 2 been rounded to the nearest 5 units? For settlements where small numbers only are proposed this can represent a significant distortion.</p>	<p>The figures could reasonably be shown as exact figures or rounded as shown. It is accepted that if rounding it is important to ensure that rounding up or down is correct.</p> <p>Whichever method is chosen it will be important to ensure that a consistent approach is taken across this document and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan which is being produced in parallel with this one.</p>	Ensure a consistent approach is taken across the district when identifying minimum housing contributions over the remaining plan period.
<i>Use actual figures</i>				
6791 - Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council (Mrs Lisa Leek) [3665]	Comment	<p>Consider that Middleton is more than provided for in terms of new housing given recent planning permissions and windfall but that what the village needs is affordable housing.</p> <p>Concerned that village may still be facing proposals from landowners for multi-unit developments on sites that SCDC and the PC have hitherto considered unsuitable.</p> <p>However, enough is enough. Since February you have granted consent for 10 residential units. With infill plots and a potential two more houses (along with four affordable homes) coming forward under your exceptions policy, we shall have more than enough market units to meet local need. (As we have said before, the market units will go as second homes or retirement properties, reinforcing our elderly demographic.) What we need is affordable homes.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The plan has to reflect a point in time. Housing figures are updated each year at the end of the monitoring period. The next period will update to 31/3/16. This is explained in the Note: which follows paragraph 2.06.</p> <p>The Council cannot stop planning applications coming forward ahead of the site allocations documents reaching adoption. It is duty bound to determine them provided sufficient information has been provided. The approach SCDC will adopt in this intervening period is set out in paragraph 3.33 of the Core Strategy</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6657 - Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council (Mrs Melanie Thurston) [3640]	Object	We do not agree with the assessment of Benhall as a Local Service Centre given its lack of facilities There is a private licensed premises to which not everybody has access.	The Preferred Option consultation document makes clear that it is not within the remit of the Site Allocations Document to amend where settlements sit within the Settlement Hierarchy.	No change
6831 - Waldringfield Parish Council (Mr David Lines) [2859]	Object	Waldringfield is wrongly identified in Table 2 as a Key Service Centre.  <i>Amend Table 2 to correctly identify Waldringfield as a Local Service Centre.</i>	This is a drafting error when putting the table together.	Amend Table 2 to correctly identify Waldringfield as a Local Service Centre
6658 - Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council (Mrs Melanie Thurston) [3640]	Object	The information on planning permissions, completions and resolutions to grant since the start of the plan period is wrong.	The planning application references have been re-checked and the Council's assessment is correct. The information in the policy and supporting table only includes new dwellings which will add to the overall housing stock.	No change
<b>Preferred Option Policy SSP1: New Housing Delivery 2015 - 2027</b>				
7620 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP1 - Early Education. General comment. Across the rural area, needs arising from many of these sites can be managed by expanding existing settings with contributions from the Community Infrastructure Levy Fund. SSP1 East Ipswich. Given that there are no proposed allocations in this area, the Plan does not, in effect, have implications for primary school provision. The 2000 dwellings envisaged as being provided through Adastral Park planning application will be required to provide a new primary school on site to mitigate the impact of this development.	Comments noted.	No change
7340 - Natural England (Sir/Madam) [2516]	Comment	We note the requirement for new housing delivery to meet, as a minimum, the Core Strategy requirement for 7,900 homes over the period 2010 - 2027.	Comment noted.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7633 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP1 Cumulative Consideration A12/14 Seven Hills. This roundabout is the main junction between the principal county road and the strategic Highways England network. It will carry a proportion of traffic generated from new development from the Felixstowe Peninsula as well as rest of district. Cumulative impacts of all the additional growth including the Ipswich area will need to be considered. Highways England may already have considered this, otherwise the junction should be included within the scope of the assessment work to be undertaken for the Felixstowe AAP.	Comments noted. The main impact on this junction is likely to be from the strategic growth area south and east of Adastral Park. Matters raised will be addressed through the planning application.	No change
7398 - Fletcher Barton Ltd (Mr William Barton) [3482]	Comment	We would suggest that a minimum of 10 units are allocated to Bawdsey, in line with other local service areas of a similar size. We would suggest that physical limits boundaries should be capable of being amended to include the allocated development. The restriction on development outside physical limits boundaries further highlights the problems identified above regarding shortage of allocated sites.	Comments noted. Policy SSP1 acknowledges that Bawdsey has already made a significant contribution to the district housing requirement with a total of 20 units built or permitted since the start of the plan period. Opportunity exists for small windfall provision with the physical limits boundary. Land adjacent to the primary school is now also subject to a resolution to grant planning permission for an additional 13 units (DC 15/4157/OUT).	No change
7656 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Cumulative Consideration Southern Sites. Key junction is the A1152/B1438 Woods Lane crossroads, Melton which carries the majority of through traffic from developments east of A12 from Orford to Bawdsey. Majority of proposed sites are small scale and impacts likely to be modest. Significant sites at Rendlesham, residential and employment, will need to fully consider impact on this junction and any collision sites and other significant sites along A1152 route. Impacts along A12 from Seven Hills to B1438 will need to be assessed once location of employment growth at Adastral identified within Adastral Park site is confirmed	Comments noted. These matters have been picked up through discussions with the highway authority as the plan has evolved to this stage. Where relevant commentary has been provided against individual site proposals eg Rendlesham. The impact of strategic development on land south and east of Adastral Park will be addressed through the planning application.	No change
7305 - Grainger PLC [585]	Comment	Promotes land at Anson Road, Martlesham, for residential development.	Comment noted. This site lies within the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan area and is therefore outside the remit of this Site Allocations Document. Site details should therefore be sent to Martlesham Parish Council for consideration through their neighbourhood plan process.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7266 - Trustees of the Adeane Bawdsey Settlement [3937]	Comment	Supports additional housing provision for Shottisham. It is vital that it has sufficient housing allocations to enable it to grow sustainably and to provide a range of housing for elderly people looking to downsize young families and couples, and single people to be able to live. In order to deliver some affordable housing to local service centres, it is important that Suffolk Coastal allows some sites of appropriate scales to ensure that housing can be delivered in an appropriate manner.	Shottisham Parish Council have indicated that they would wish to identify a site for new housing provision for a small number of units. A number of options have been considered. The preferred site, which provides the option for additional community benefit through the provision of off-street parking is for Land opposite the Sorrel Horse, The Street, Shottisham.	See new policy SSP15 Land opposite Sorrel Horse, The Street, Shottisham
7655 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP1 Waste. Suffolk Waste Plan policy WDM17 requires that development minimises waste and to facilitate the sorting of waste and promotion of recycling. Individual sites will be required to consider how they meet those expectations. SCDC may also consider in their role as Waste Collection Authority, it would be justified to include on-site communal recycling facilities (bring sites). Under CIL, SCC will identify level of provision needed to serve population growth and projects to meet it.	Comments noted. It is considered that these matters are more appropriately dealt with at the planning application stage.	No change
7006 - Evolution Town Planning (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [3055]	Comment	In the event that one or more neighbourhood plans do not deliver on their housing contributions, Tunstall should be provided with a residual allocation that allows for future expansion of the village.	There is no indication at this stage to suggest that neighbourhood plans will not deliver the housing contributions allocated to them. If delays do occur the appropriate place to deal with them is via the Local Plan review.	No change
7658 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Cumulative Consideration Southern Sites Melton Crossroads. Proposed development taken together with existing traffic and background growth in vehicular traffic means cumulative impact is likely to be significant. It is unlikely that transport issues would render the sites undeliverable (under the ill-defined "severe" test set out in NPPF) However an increase in queuing at junction would have to be expected. This may require further consideration in respect of air quality issues	Comments noted. They reflect the substance of discussions held with the highway authority and which have informed the development of the plan to date. Whilst cumulative impacts have been taken into consideration in regard to individual sites proposed through this plan, the same discussions will need to be had with regard to schemes which may be progressed through the neighbourhood plans for Melton and Woodbridge which will potentially impact on this junction.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7635 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP1 Surface Water Management. SCC is the Lead Local Flood Authority for flood risk arising from sources other than rivers and the sea. Maps will be provided which show the EA flood map for surface water and locations where SCC has records of surface water flooding. It does not appear that existing flood risk will render any of the sites undeliverable, but some sites include records of surface water flooding which may affect site layouts and developable areas. Developers will need to have early discussions with the SCC Floods and Water	Comments noted and the District Council will encourage developers to speak to the SCC as Lead Local Flood Authority as early as possible.	Include specific reference to surface water flooding against relevant policies.
7653 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Waste and minerals. The County Council as Minerals and Waste Authority has no objection to the proposed allocations in respect of the minerals and waste plans on grounds of conflict with permitted and allocated mineral and waste sites.	Comments noted	No change
6965 - The Kesgrave Covenant Ltd [1342]	Comment	There has not been a review of the CS and the Council's Local Development Scheme identifies that the Issues and Options version of the Plan will be produced October 2016, the first draft of the Plan will be published in September 2018 with adoption in November/December 2019. This does not reflect the early review promised, and the Council is proceeding on the basis of what it knows to be an under provision of housing, contrary to the requirements of the NPPF. It may be another 8 years or so until sufficient sites are allocated to meet Objectively Assessment Housing Needs.	Comment noted. The remit of the Site Allocations Document is to meet as a minimum the housing requirement set out in the Core Strategy.	No change
7208 - Hacheston Parish Council (Mr Bartholomew Hall) [3513]	Comment	Clarification required in respect of the housing numbers suggested for Hacheston.	The information for Hacheston is unclear. Rounding to the nearest 5 units should have rounded down to 5. However, it is considered that there is potential for some additional housing at this settlement. A new site is now proposed through the plan for 8 units.	The table will need to be updated to reflect various revisions to plan. See also new policy SSP9 Land south of Solomons Rest, The Street, Hacheston.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7036 - Westerfield Parish Council (Mr Peter Miller) [3597]	Comment	Some concern over the number of new houses identified for Westerfield compared to other key or local service centres. It is considered the document should do more to explain this anomaly. The Parish Council view on Policy SSP1 is therefore mixed. The general principle in this document is considered well written but the allocation of 30 minimum new houses for Westerfield should be reconsidered.	Comments noted. A more detailed explanation of how the housing figures have been derived would be beneficial and add clarity and understanding. With regard to policy SSP1 and associated text and tables, these have been included to demonstrate the scale of provision which settlements are contributing / have already contributed through the plan period to date. Issues relating to Westerfield are addressed under the relevant policies.	Expand section to explain approach to housing distribution and allocations
7009 - Evolution Town Planning (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [3055]	Comment	In the absence of robust evidence to the contrary, or as part of a provisional allocation in the event that one or more neighbourhood plans do not deliver on their housing contributions, Blaxhall should be provided with a residual allocation that allows for future expansion of the village. The emerging site allocations document relies significantly on three neighbourhood plans to deliver approximately 600 to 900 dwellings towards the district council's minimum target but the delivery of housing through these plans is not certain	There is no evidence to suggest that the neighbourhood plans will not deliver the housing numbers allocated to them. If delays do occur, the appropriate mechanism for considering this matter is through the review of the Local Plan	No change
7289 - Leiston Land Ltd/Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [3946]	Comment	An additional policy in the SCSAASP that provides a strategy for 'land to the rear of St Margaret's Crescent, Leiston, Suffolk' should set the strategic direction that will be supplemented by Policy SA3 of the Leiston Neighbourhood Plan, which identifies Land to the rear of St Margaret's Crescent for approximately 70 dwellings	Comment noted. This site lies within the area covered by the Leiston neighbourhood plan and is appropriately considered through the neighbourhood plan process. The amount of housing provided for in the neighbourhood plan has been determined in consultation with the district council and service providers. Good progress is being made with the neighbourhood plan which will make a significant contribution to the housing numbers identified for the market towns in the adopted Core Strategy. Policy SSP1 provides the linkage between the site allocations document and neighbourhood plans by setting out the minimum housing requirements each plan is expected to contribute.	No change
7631 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP1 Transport. SCC has previously commented on these sites through the SHLAA process and on additional sites upon request. Sites will be expected to consider their transport impacts through Transport Assessments or Statements (as appropriate) at the planning application stage.	Comments noted. Where appropriate reference to the need for a transport assessment is noted in respect of individual site policies.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7619 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP1 - Primary Education. General comment. Availability of places at primary schools across the district varies markedly. At present it appears that the proposed distribution of housing can be managed in terms of additional school places, but in some areas will take schools to the limits of their capacity. Further growth (in addition to/outside of) this proposed distribution might not be manageable without new facilities, including new schools being provided. The approaches are based upon school site sizes and government guidance on space requirements.	Comments noted.	No change
7630 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP1 Sustainable Development. Proposals will need to demonstrate that opportunities for sustainable travel have been maximised, that access arrangements are safe and highway impacts have been sufficiently mitigated.	Comments noted. These matters are addressed in relation to individual sites.	No change
7268 - Strutt and Parker (Melissa Reynolds) [3938]	Comment	Promotes development of a site Land North of the A14 at Nacton for future development either meeting housing requirements or providing economic development, leisure or community opportunities in a sustainable location close to a major centre and easily accessible in terms of transport connections, both vehicular and pedestrian.	This site has been assessed and is considered to be unsuitable for development for a variety of reasons, but primarily its limited access and relative remoteness from any other settlement.	No change
7625 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP 1- Secondary and Sixth Form Education. Assessment for Rural Suffolk Coastal shows that it is unlikely additional capacity will be needed outside of the Farlingaye catchment. The Adastral Park site is intended to provide for the establishment of a new secondary school facility which in the longer term would be a new school in its own right. Should Adastral Park continue to be delayed a new strategy would have to be developed for Woodbridge and East Ipswich area. Sending pupils to schools in the north of the district is not SCC's first preference given distances involved and travel costs.	Comments noted.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7632 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP1 Public Rights of Way. Development proposals must endeavour to enable and improve access to the countryside via the PROW. Where development is likely to result in increased footfall on PROW network improvements may be sought to mitigate the additional use. This is important for encouraging sustainable transport, promoting exercise and supporting Suffolk Coastal's tourism offer.	Comments noted. These comments reflect the intent of Core Strategy Objective 14 Green Infrastructure and will be addressed through the Site Allocations policies and planning applications. At the same time the Council is minded of the need to minimise the potential impacts of dog walkers on sites important for their nature conservation value; in particular European sites.	No change
6563 - Mr Martin Price [3128]	Comment	I wish for this site (3948) land at Street Farm Yard, Brandeston Road Earl Soham to be formally considered in the emerging Site Allocations Document. The only reason that the site was discounted in the 2014 SHLAA was the lack of any footway connection to the centre of the village as advised by the Highway Authority. This has now been resolved.  <i>Inclusion of site at Street Farm Yard Brandeston Road Earl Soham as a housing allocation</i>	It may be possible for an acceptable scheme to come forward. However due to sensitive design issues - presence of a listed barn - it is considered that this is more appropriately progressed via a planning application.	No change.
7660 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	The sites in Westerfield will need to be considered alongside the Ipswich Garden Suburb allocation. In respect of SSP15 (Land at Old Station Works) opportunities for pedestrian and cycle access south of the railway should be considered.	Comment noted. These matters are picked up under the relevant site specific policies relating to Westerfield	No change
7626 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP1 - Libraries. Libraries help create the sustainable healthy communities referred to in Chapter 8 of NPPF. Under CIL regime, County Council will work with Suffolk Libraries to identify need and develop bespoke projects library by library. In rare cases provision may be sought on-site within very large developments to be delivered through planning obligations.	Comments noted.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7598 - Gladman Developments (Mr Peter Dutton) [3955]	Comment	There is now a critical need to identify further deliverable and developable housing sites in the district, over and above the 3,445 homes identified to be allocated through the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD, to meet Suffolk Coastal's full objectively assessed needs. Rather than seeking to progress a suppressed level of housing delivery in each of the authority's settlements, we submit that the Council should now be looking to identify further deliverable and developable housing sites, to provide for a higher level of housing growth in the district	The remit of the site allocations document, neighbourhood plans and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan is to implement the Core Strategy. Together they will provide for "at least" the 7,900 homes requirement in the adopted Core Strategy document. Discussions regarding higher levels of housing provision are a matter for the Local Plan Review.	No change
7601 - Gladman Developments (Mr Peter Dutton) [3955]	Comment	Promotes development of land off Duke's Park Woodbridge for residential development.	This site lies within the Woodbridge (with part of Martlesham) neighbourhood plan and is therefore outside of the remit of this Site Allocations Document.	No change
7028 - Aldeburgh Society (Mr Tony Bone) [3834]	Comment	Page20. refers to the housing already built in the plan period, or committed by permissions already granted, and reveals that the total number already committed is only 10 short of the target to be achieved by the year 2027. We concur with this number as in para 2.09 which we feel is realistic in terms of demand (and also would not overload the local infrastructure).	Comment noted.	No change
7634 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SSP1 Cumulative Consideration Saxmundham/Leiston area. Most additional traffic associated with new development proposals for Leiston via neighbourhood plan. Specific junctions where concern is raised are B1069 / A1094; and A12/A1094 Friday Street. The most likely route from Leiston to the A12 is through Saxmundham therefore impacts on B1121/B1119 junction will need monitoring as plan is implemented. These locations are also likely to require assessment as Sizewell C comes forward. SCC will seek CIL contributions if improvement measures are required as a result of overall growth in the area. Transport Assessment of individual sites may justify planning obligations through legal agreement.	Comments noted. These are matters which it will be relevant to pick up through the monitoring and delivery framework and through the consideration of individual planning applications as and when they are submitted.	Reference to be picked up through the new section on Monitoring and Delivery

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7011 - Evolution Town Planning (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [3055]	Comment	In the absence of robust evidence to the contrary, or as part of a provisional allocation in the event that one or more of the 'larger' neighbourhood plans do not deliver on their housing contributions, Bredfield should be provided with the allocation for 10 dwellings that allows for future expansion of the village and until such time as its neighbourhood plan is ready to take over.	Bredfield is now undertaking its own neighbourhood plan. The minimum new housing allocation identified in the table accompanying policy SSP1 confirms 10 units.	No change
7430 - Framlingham Town Council (Mrs Eileen Coe) [3557]	Comment	New housing delivery for Framlingham is included in the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan	Comment noted	No change
7020 - Christchurch Property Company Limited [2980] 7022 - Christchurch Property Company Limited [2980] 7026 - Christchurch Property Company Limited [2980]	Object	The Site Allocations Document does not address the full objectively assessed housing need, therefore, a site at a sustainable location (abutting the settlement edge) it is considered that this should be a site that is allocated for residential development. Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework considers that for a plan to be considered "sound" it should be "positively prepared", that the plan should meet objectively development. This emerging plan therefore in not addressing the FOAN for the district, it is submitted, is not "positively prepared".	Comment noted. The remit of the Site Allocations Neighbourhood Plans and Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan together is to meet "at least" the minimum housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy	No change
7214 - Artisan Planning & Property Services Ltd (Mr Leslie Short) [3923]	Object	The Policy wording emphasises the implied flexibility in relation to housing numbers with phrases such as 'at least the minimum' in respect of the Core Strategy numbers and then makes Plans for individual settlements drawn tightly around those settlements to which a policy will apply which is unduly restrictive and is based upon those same housing figures being considered as very much a maximum number. There is little or no flexibility in that approach which is or holds the prospect for a sensitive and appropriate proposal for a sustainable form of development coming forward because of subsequent and unforeseen change	The remit of the Site Allocations Document, neighbourhood plans and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan is to implement the Core Strategy. Together they will identify sufficient land to meet as a minimum the 7,900 home requirement in the adopted Core Strategy. The revised physical limits boundary will provide certainty to communities and to service providers as to what is proposed and how it will be provided for over the plan period. In addition to site allocations, there are opportunities within the physical limits boundaries for small windfall opportunities. Policy DM1 in the Core Strategy also enables affordable housing to come forward on "exception sites".	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7183 - Taylor Wimpey [2902]	Object	<p>My client's interests are in Framlingham where the emerging Neighbourhood Plan is not seeking to allocate sites beyond the 200 identified in Table 2 . As Framlingham is a Market Town it is logical that this settlement should deliver more housing to help the District meet its housing needs in full. The SAASP should be requiring this as such an approach would be consistent with the adopted Core Strategy. I consider that Policy SSP1 is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy.</p>	<p>The Framlingham neighbourhood plan is looking to provide the minimum housing requirement identified for it by the Council. It is not a requirement that it should provide for more than is an option and a decision to be taken into account as part of their plan making process. It is being positively prepared. Ultimately the choice of sites identified to meet this housing number is a matter for that plan making process. The site allocation document, neighbourhood plans and Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan will, together, meet as a minimum the housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. That is their remit.</p>	No change
7257 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd [2719]	Object	<p>Given that it is now known that the Adastral Park applicant intends to resubmit their application we consider that the development will not contribute to housing supply at the delivery rates either previously anticipated or at the revised rates now anticipated within the Preferred Options Document.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Whilst Adastral Park may not contribute as much as originally anticipated through the plan period, it will still make a significant contribution to the 7,900 homes (minimum) Core Strategy housing requirement. The site allocations documents will identify sufficient land to ensure that this minimum housing figure is provided for through the plan period.</p>	Table updated to reflect latest anticipated contribution of 1575 units.
7181 - Taylor Wimpey [2902]	Object	<p>Note that despite the reference to minimum targets on page 17 there is no such reference in either Table 2 or Policy SSP1 when referring to individual settlements. I acknowledge the reference in paragraph 2.09 that Neighbourhood Plans are expected to provide the relevant quantum of housing as a minimum and that they may plan for more. However, given the fact that the Core Strategy is already failing to plan for its OAN it is considered that the SAASP should be actively encouraging housing above the requirements identified.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policy SSP1 already refers to "... at least the minimum Core Strategy housing delivery for the plan area...". Table 2 final column also refers to "indicative minimum requirements". With reference to objectively assessed need, the remit of the site allocations document, neighbourhood plans and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan is that in total they meet as a minimum the housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. It will be for the Local Plan Review to update the full objectively assessed housing needs for the district.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7240 - Grainger PLC [585]	Object	The arguments advanced by the Council at the Core Strategy for placing all of the housing requirement within a single allocation have been shown to be ineffective, and thus, to continue to advance that case via the Site Allocations DPD process will lead to the Plan being found unsound, given such a strategy is neither effective, nor justified. Mathematically, the Council now has too few years and too much requirement to make up in the Plan Period for this current strategy to be considered deliverable.	The issues raised are outside of the remit of the site allocations document as the scale and distribution of new development were considered through the evolution of the now adopted Core Strategy. The issues raised are ones which are more appropriately addressed through the Local Plan Review. In the meantime, the site allocations documents will meet as a minimum the 7,900 home requirement set out in the Core Strategy. BT are progressing their development proposals for strategic growth at Adastral Park.	No change
7245 - Mr David Trouse [167]	Object	Overall I think that the proposed development [at Adastral Park] of 2000 homes is out of scale (too large) considering the surroundings. It would overwhelm the existing settlements. Such a development would impose large negative impacts on the surrounding transport infrastructure and environment - notwithstanding stated intentions to mitigate these impacts. The council seems intent on imposing this large scale development as a perceived easy solution to an assumed but unsubstantiated housing demand demand without adequate consideration of the alternatives eg smaller housing growth overall or more widely distributed growth across the whole SCDC area.	The identification of Adastral Park as a strategic location for growth was debated and tested through the preparation and independent Examination of the Core Strategy and was subsequently adopted in July 2013. It is not the role of the Site Allocations document to reconsider this growth location.	No change
7185 - Taylor Wimpey [2902]	Object	The Sustainability Appraisal of the Housing policies does not take into account the sustainability implications of adopting a Site Allocations Plan that has not been prepared in accordance with an up to date OAN. It is unclear how it can score so highly when under criterion 7 of policy SSP1. The assessment considers that policy SSP1 will meet the housing need of the plan area. As the Core Strategy requirement openly acknowledges it is not meeting the full, objectively assessed need it cannot be concluded that a policy aimed at meeting the Core Strategy requirement meets the housing need.	The remit of the Site Allocations Document is to meet as a minimum the housing requirement set out in the Core Strategy. It is this approach that has been subject to the SA process. Any changes to the new strategic housing target for the District will be developed as part of a review of the Core Strategy and subject to its own SA process.	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7109 - Hopkins Homes [551]	Object	<p>There is a significant step change in housing required in the Planto meet what is realistically required as the District's objectively assessed need and accommodate unmet need from elsewhere, the overreliance on a large housing site which is likely to have delivery implications and the lack of direction for designated Neighbourhood Plan areas.</p> <p>Hopkins Homes therefore contends that the Plan should be proposing sites to deliver a significantly higher housing number, particularly at identified Market Towns, Key and Local Service Centre which should receive allocations proportionate to their size, role and function within the settlement hierarchy.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The remit of the Site Allocations Document, Neighbourhood Plans and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan is to identify as a minimum the housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. These documents will do this. An update of the full objectively assessed need for the district will be undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review. The reference to overreliance on a single large site refers to the strategic growth at Adastral Park. This is an argument which was made on numerous occasions as the Core Strategy progressed through to adoption. Work is on-going with regard to delivery of this site via a planning application rather than the site allocations process.</p>	No change
6790 - ONR (Tim Randles) [3772]	Object	<p>I would advise against the adoption of Preferred Option Policy SSP1, insofar as it states "new housing delivery should be provided in accordance with Table 2". Need to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is it reasonably practicable to achieve the same planning objective by allocating a site or sites outside the DEPZ or, if not,</li> <li>2) Is it reasonably practicable to achieve the same planning objective by allocating a site or sites further from the nuclear site(s) boundary?</li> <li>3) Does the proposed (scale of) development represent an external hazard to the site?</li> <li>4) Can the proposed (scale of) development be accommodated within the off-site plan.</li> </ol>	<p>New housing is being provided in Leiston through the Leiston Neighbourhood Plan which has now completed its pre-submission consultation. The Town Council has consulted with and been in dialogue with the ONR and SCC in their emergency planning role as part of their plan making process. Accordingly, given the progress with the Neighbourhood Plan, the Site Allocations Document can now include a more precise number of new homes for inclusion within policy SSP1 and the associated table.</p>	Update table which accompanies policy SSP1 to reflect housing numbers now identified in the Leiston Neighbourhood Plan (400 units)
7325 - Mr G Ogilvie [3382]	Object	<p>The reason given for not taking site 3005 forward is that "Aldringham-cum Thorpe will be producing a neighbourhood plan" although the detail and timescale for the production of the plan are not currently set out. As such, the Council have concluded that the 2015 residential requirement for the parish is zero and they would not look to allocate sites at this time. The lack of detail and timescale for development of the Neighbourhood Plan indicates that the District have not considered what the housing requirement is in Aldringham</p>	<p>Site 3005 has been reconsidered and taking into account viability evidence is now identified as suitable for approximately 40 dwellings.</p>	Allocate site SSP4 for approximately 40 dwellings.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7410 - Bidwells (Laura Hunter) [3941]	Object	<p>Aldeburgh appears to be allocated very substantially less than the other market towns. Ten new dwellings between now and 2027, a period of 12 years, suggests that the town will not be able to meet its housing needs or address the age imbalance in the local area which is identified as an objective in Core Strategy policy SP22. To achieve what the Town Map and Core Strategy is suggesting will require green field development. More than the allocated ten dwellings will be required</p> <p><i>Significantly increase the allocation for Aldeburgh.</i></p>	<p>The limited allocation for Aldeburgh reflects the fact that the town is severely constrained in terms of opportunities for new development. Infill and re-development within the existing urban area is likely to provide the main opportunities for development. Even with this, the town will contribute close to 100 new units over the plan period.</p>	No change
7075 - Evolution Town Planning (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [3055]	Object	<p>Draft policy SSP1 describes the apportionment of housing delivery across the district in the plan period. It includes a table of settlements which are being allocated development to meet the minimum housing requirement. The incorrect assessment of the site (site ref 3596) against the sustainability objectives has prejudiced its performance through the Site Allocations process and we request this is looked at and remedial action taken as necessary and the site included into SSP1 for a proportionate amount of housing for Butley.</p> <p>Allocating even 10 houses to this site in Butley would allow the village to grow proportionately</p>	<p>The site referred to is the former school site at Butley. It has been re-considered as requested but the Council remains of the view that it should be rejected as being out of scale and character with the settlement. No other suitable sites have been identified.</p>	No change
2.10				
6671 - Wickham Market Parish Council (Mr Richard Jenkinson) [3106]	Comment	<p>Supports the zero allocation within the plan period. This is in accordance with the wishes of the Parish residents.</p> <p>Confirms their Neighbourhood Plan will look beyond 2027 and it is intended to suggest where future housing development (hopefully post 2027) should take place.</p>	<p>Support and comment noted. Wickham Market recently applied for neighbourhood area designation. The designation was approved on 12 January 2016.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6627 - Mr Cyril Fidler [3736]	Object	<p>I object to the proposed changes to the existing village boundary for Benhall. At least 3 areas within the existing boundary are proposed for removal in favour of 2 areas (411 &amp; 969 SHLAA) to be added. Both are poorly related to the village and will result in estate style development.</p> <p>New housing in Benhall should take the form of infill within the existing settlement.</p> <p>The area around Ella House, Aldecar Lane is proposed for removal.</p> <p>What is the reason for this? There has been housing on this site for many years as shown on the 1887 OS map.</p> <p><i>Do not remove land /housing from the existing boundary</i></p>	<p>Physical limits boundaries will be drawn to include sites for which planning permission has been granted and for the site proposed for allocation for development through the plan reflecting the extent of development expected through the plan period.</p> <p>The area around Ella House has been re-considered and is now identified for inclusion within the physical limits boundary.</p>	<p>Amend physical limits boundary for Benhall to include Ella House and the plots immediately to the north and south of the building which have the benefit of planning permission. Policy SSP6 now deleted.</p>
6873 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Support	I agree with these sentiments as to the importance of village envelopes .	Support noted.	No change

## 2.11

6875 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Support	I support this statement	Support noted
-------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	---------------

## 2.13

6958 - Mrs Margaret Blades [3867]	Object	<p>I object to my properties Ella House and Danfers being removed from the physical limits boundary in Aldecar Lane Benhall. Dwelling have been on this site for more than 150 years. This does not appear to be a logical decision.</p> <p><i>Leave the physical limits as they currently are. Do not implement the proposed changes.</i></p>	<p>Physical limits boundaries will be re-drawn to include sites with planning permission and sites allocated for new development. Ella House has been re-considered and the house together with the plots to the north and south of the actual house which have the benefit of planning permission will be included within the physical limits boundary.</p>	<p>Amend physical limits boundary for Benhall to include Ella House and the plots immediately to the north and south of the actual house which have the benefit of planning permission.</p>
-----------------------------------	--------	--	--	---

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
2.14	Object	<p>I do not follow the proposed physical limit changes to Benhall and certainly do not regard the proposed changes as logical.</p> <p>Bennall does not need an estate type development (SHLAA 411). The historic pattern of development in the village is linear comprising traditional style properties.</p> <p><i>Building should be planned within the body of the village.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. The physical limits boundary are drawn to reflect the main built area of a settlement. They are updated to include sites for which there is an extant planning permission or which are identified as allocations.</p>	<p>Amend physical limits boundary for Benhall to include Ella House and the plots immediately to the north and south of the house itself.</p>
2.15	Comment	<p>We agree with the sentiments of paragraph 2.15, but do not believe this has been implemented in line with paragraph 2.16 in the Chapel area of Witnesham as the PLB omits two sites which benefit from planning permission (DC/14/1296/OUT and DC/14/1364/FUL).</p>	<p>These two sites were both allowed on appeal in December 2014. They are located on the edge of the built up area and will be included within a revised physical limits boundary for Witnesham (Chapel)</p>	<p>Amend physical limits boundary for Witnesham (Chapel) to include land at Hill Crest and Wood Farm Upper Street.</p>
6754 - Mrs Wendy Mannall [3787]	Object	<p>The proposed Benhall Green physical limits boundary seeks to remove various areas within the body of the village which could have accommodated a small number of individually designed dwellings.</p> <p>The proposal does not as suggested include sites for which planning has been granted and indeed seeks to remove some existing properties in favour of a proposed estate at the entrance to the village.</p>	<p>The boundary has been reconsidered in two respects. Ella House and the plots immediately to the north and south of the house have the benefit of planning permission are to be retained within the physical limits boundary.</p> <p>The physical limits boundary has also been reconsidered in respect of the rear garden of 36 Benhall Green which is included within the 2001 physical limits boundary. Planting along the eastern boundary provides a clear divide between the village and the countryside beyond.</p>	<p>Amend physical limits boundary for Benhall to include Ella House and the plots immediately to the north and south of the house which have the benefit of planning permission for housing. Retain the 2001 physical limit boundary alignment to include the rear garden of 36 Benhall Green.</p>
6629 - Mr Cyril Fidler [3736]	Object	<p>In Benhall, permission was granted in May 2013 C13/0193/OUT for a dwelling outside the physical limits and in an SLA.</p> <p>This site is not included in the proposed boundary</p> <p><i>Include in boundary</i></p>	<p>The site referred to is plot 1 Ella House is intended should now be included within the physical limits boundary.</p>	<p>Amend physical limits boundary for Benhall to include Ella House and the plots immediately to the north and south of the house which have the benefit of planning permission.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6942 - Mr Paul Mannall [3855]	Object	The proposed physical limits boundaries do not include but actually intend to remove existing and proposed dwellings in Aldecar Lane contrary to the statement in paragraph 2.15.	The physical limits boundary for Aldecar Lane has been re-considered. It is intended that Ella House and plots immediately to the north and south of the actual house which have the benefit of planning permission will be included within the physical limits boundary.	Amend physical limits boundary for Benhall to include Ella House and the plots immediately to the north and south of the house which have the benefit of planning permission.
<i>Leave the boundaries as they currently are in Aldecar Lane.</i>				
6943 - Mr Paul Mannall [3855]	Comment	How can you be certain that applying 'an element of discretion' has any bearing on the views of the community, let alone 'better reflects the views of that individual community'. Or are the views simply those of the Parish Council?	Suggestions are considered on their merits and having regard to the individual circumstance. Suggestions may be put forward by individuals or the parish/town council. They are tested through consultation.	No change
6561 - Mrs Caroline Gold [3102]	Object	SCDC have a preferred option to extend the physical boundaries of Bawdsey to include the recently discounted SHLAA site 303 which in the same consultation has been discounted as an Allocation because of its poor sustainability score. This bizarre discrepancy would appear to be either a mistake or an attempt by SCDC to slip houses through the back door as "windfall".	This site was discounted as an allocation at the Preferred Options stage as there was no certainty that an acceptable scheme could be provided on the site. The site had also attracted local opposition both to the plan and an outstanding planning application at that time. In terms of the plan and the drafting of the physical limits boundary, East Lane was considered to represent a logical limit to the extent of the built area of the village so was identified as the preferred option physical limit boundary for the village at this location. The site has since been subject to a resolution to grant planning permission for 13 units. On that basis the physical limits boundary would remain as shown in the Preferred Options consultation. However it is suggested that the remaining treed area which is subject to a recent Tree Preservation Order is identified as an area to be protected from development.	No change to physical limits boundary for Bawdsey. Identify the treed area the subject of the recent Tree Preservation Order as an area to be protected from development
<i>Exclude the area from the physical limits boundary</i>				

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<b>Preferred Option SSP2: Physical Limits Boundaries</b>				
7599 - Gladman Developments (Mr Peter Dutton) [3955]	Comment	<p>Gladman would object to the use of physical limit or settlement boundaries if these would only serve to preclude otherwise sustainable development from taking place on the edge of settlements. Such as an approach would fail to fulfil the national objective boosting significantly the supply of housing and would run contrary to the costs/benefit approach to decision making that national policy advocates.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The physical limits boundaries will include within them sites with planning permission and those allocated for development as required to implement the adopted Core Strategy. It does so within the context of a plan led approach to development needs.</p>	No change
		<p><i>Rather than looking to impose physical limit boundaries, Gladman suggest the following policy wording, to take account of the above issues:</i></p>		
		<p><i>"Development in the countryside adjacent to existing settlements will be permitted provided that the adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development"</i></p>		
7023 - Christchurch Property Company Limited [2980]	Comment	<p>In principle, no objection is raised to the proposed inclusion of settlement boundaries within the Site Allocations document, subject to any boundaries being drawn to include land allocations to facilitate the required level growth to accommodate the Council's objectively assessed need for housing and employment growth.</p> <p>The identification of settlement boundaries should not be used as an arbitrary or artificial means to restrict or limit growth</p>	<p>Physical limits boundaries will incorporate sites with planning permission and site allocations for new housing which is required to meet the minimum housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Further reviews of the physical limits boundaries will undoubtedly be required as a result of the Local Plan Review.</p>	No change
7322 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [2605]	Comment	<p>The document also includes a number of settlement boundary amendments. Whilst we support the redrawing of boundaries to tighten them around existing development, there are a number of settlements where the boundary has been extended to take in new areas for development. Of particular concern are extensions at Bawdsey and Rushmere St Andrew where ecological surveys accompanying recent planning applications have demonstrated that the areas have existing biodiversity value. This evidence should be taken into account through the Local Plan process and settlement boundaries should not be amended to take in areas which are of existing biodiversity value.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Sites whether put forward by way of planning applications or through the site allocations process are subject as a minimum to a desk top study to identify and take into consideration any known biodiversity features. In the site allocations document these are referenced in relation to individual sites. In addition, adopted policies SP14 and DM27 in the Core Strategy would still apply.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6673 - Wickham Market Parish Council (Mr Richard Jenkinson) [3106]	Comment	<p>Regarding the map showing the Built Area boundary for Wickham Market there are a number of alterations which we wish you to consider. The amendments suggested are;</p> <p>The built area boundary should be expanded to include the affordable homes built as part of the new Coop development.</p> <p>There are two areas which have had new housing developments which are not shown on the map, one adjacent to the Gospel Hall development at the north of the Village and one at the old "Parma" industries site just south of the Border Cot lane and High St junction.</p>	Amendments to physical limits boundary include sites with planning permission. Further amendments may be considered through the neighbourhood plan work.	Paragraph 2.21 amended to include reference to the inclusion of sites with planning permission
7431 - Framlingham Town Council (Mrs Eileen Coe) [3557]	Comment	<p>The physical limits boundary of Framlingham are known and defined in the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan. Framlingham Town Council is concerned by the comments contained within para.2.15 (page 24 ) that new site allocations and sites for which planning permission has been granted should be included within the revised physical limits boundary. We would like to put on record that we do not agree that new site allocations should be included, this is considered to be too premature and is a considerable risk to encouraging inappropriate development and will encourage the inevitable domino effect on such.</p>	The suggestion is inconsistent with strategic policies in the adopted core strategy including SP29 - The Countryside. Including allocations within a revised physical limits boundary would provide a consistent approach across the district	No change.
7400 - Artisan Planning & Property Services Ltd (Mr Leslie Short) [3923]	Object	Why has barn adjacent to The Firs Church Road been omitted from the physical limits boundary.	The boundary at this point has been re-considered. The omission appears to have been a drafting error. In visual terms it is logical that the barn is included within the physical limits boundary.	Amend physical limits boundary for Marlesford to include the barn adjacent to The Firs Church Road.
7399 - Fletcher Barton Ltd (Mr William Barton) [3482]	Object	As planning policies should be based on the most up to date evidence it is illogical to prevent development outside the current limits when it is inevitable that more land will be needed. Policy SSP2 sets an unnecessary policy obstacle to development that cannot be considered to be positively prepared given the lack of up to date evidence on housing need.	Policy SSP2 will update existing physical limits boundaries to include sites with planning permission and sites allocated for new residential use required to meet at least the minimum housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. These boundaries will undoubtedly change again in the future as a result of the Local Plan Review.	No change

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
6994 - Hopkins Homes (Mr Robert Eburne) [2704]	Object	<p>The physical limits boundaries are largely unchanged in 17 years. However, planning policy at a national level has become significantly more positive towards rural housing development since 2012 and 2014 when the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance were introduced. The District Council is failing to provide for its Objectively Assessed Housing Need in this document and in the Core Strategy which should have been reviewed in 2015. The Physical Limits boundaries are outmoded and restrain development thus putting downward pressure on housing supply and restricting sustainable growth.</p>	<p>Physical limits boundaries are an important policy tool which looks to distinguish policies for the countryside from those areas to which development would be directed. As revised and updated, they will incorporate those sites for which planning permission has been granted as well as those which are allocated for housing development which together are required to meet the housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Changes to physical limits boundaries will undoubtedly occur in coming years as housing numbers and distribution are updated through the Local Plan Review process.</p>	No change
7418 - Save our Country Spaces (MRS Barbara Robinson) [364]	Object	<p>It proposes changes to the Policies map in relation to the new proposed approach to Physical Limits Boundaries; the boundaries against which future decisions will be made. This will have the potential for serious unintended consequences and may undermine SP 29 and Neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>It is our understanding that this change of approach to Physical Limits Boundaries and the impacts that that will have on protection of countryside, gaps, open spaces and prevent coalescence, can only be done via a Review of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>It is the role of the Site Allocations Document, neighbourhood plans and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan to update the physical limits boundaries to ensure that at least the minimum housing requirement for the district as set out in the adopted Core Strategy can be met. Neighbourhood plans are encouraged to follow the approach set out in the Site Allocations Document. Policy SP29 will apply to land outside of the revised physical limits boundaries. The site allocations documents and the policies they contain more generally are those required to implement the Core Strategy so are the appropriate vehicle for consideration of these matters.</p>	No change
7182 - Taylor Wimpey [2902]	Object	<p>The restriction on development outside of physical limits boundaries further highlights the problems identified by preparing this document ahead of the revised housing need work.</p> <p>Where there are limited options for development within the existing settlement it is inevitable that sites beyond the settlement will be identified. As planning policies should be based on the most up to date evidence it is illogical to prevent development outside of current limits. Policy SSP2 sets an unnecessary policy obstacle to development that cannot be considered to be positively prepared given the lack of up to date evidence on housing need.</p>	<p>Policy SSP2 provides the basis for updating physical limits boundaries to meet the housing requirements set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The revised physical limits will include within them sites with extant planning permissions and sites which are allocated for development through the plan process. It is accepted that most new development will be on greenfield sites which, ahead of the site allocations being adopted, will be classed as countryside.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6876 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Support	I fully support this proposed policy	Support noted.	No change
6679 - Martlesham Parish Council (Mrs Susan Robertson) [486]	Support	We welcome the proposal that the physical limits for Martlesham/ Martlesham Heath will be put forward by the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan group. We support the Preferred Option SSP2: Physical Limits Boundaries	Support noted	No change
6682 - Easton Parish Council (Mrs Sue Piggott) [3509]	Support	The revised Parish Boundary	Support noted.	No change

## 2.17

7627 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>This paragraph highlights that stakeholders have identified a need for older people's housing. The County Council concurs with this assessment, based on information in the Ipswich Strategic Housing Market Assessment (covering Suffolk Coastal) and other sources.</p> <p><i>Change to Plan. The Council should consider going further and putting in place policies which demonstrate that the housing mix reflects different needs. This would help to implement policy SP3 in the Core Strategy.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. The exact mix of properties on any individual site is more properly addressed at the planning application stage. The text in paragraph 2.17 reiterates what is said in the Core Strategy with specific reference to provision linked to meeting the needs of older and younger people. Developers will also be expected to demonstrate that they have taken note of feedback from local communities when they have undertaken pre-application consultation.</p>	No change
6628 - Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC Environmental Protection) [2963]	Comment	<p>It is sometimes difficult to convey to developers the importance of AQ impacts in respect of developments which may be, (by their own judgement) a significant distance from the Woodbridge AQMA; efforts to find ways of reducing the elevated levels of transport-related pollutants at this location to below the levels required by the EU Air Quality Directive have consistently failed to produce the required improvements in the 10 years or so since this AQMA was declared, which could result in financial penalties to the UK; any such penalties will be passed on to LAs with "failing" AQMAs in their districts.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Air quality impacts noted against individual site proposals have been incorporated into the relevant policies. For other developments it is expected that air quality issues will continue to be raised via the normal planning application consultation process.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7610 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Paragraph 2.17 highlights that stakeholders have identified a need for older people's housing. The County Council concurs with this assessment, based on information in the Ipswich Strategic Housing Market Assessment (covering Suffolk Coastal) and other sources.	Comment noted.	No change
7172 - National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (A.R Yarwood) [3910]	Comment	<p>The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups comments:</p> <p>It is disappointing to note the absence of any reference to the needs of Gypsies.</p> <p>In particular, we respond to the following question:</p> <p>Q5. Thinking about your own community, the people who live there, the people who would want to live there but maybe can't because there is nowhere suitable - what type and mix of housing do you think is most needed to meet your community's needs?</p> <p>Answer - Gypsies and Travellers.</p>	<p>The Council's approach to gypsies and travellers is set out in the adopted Core Strategy policy SP4 and DM9. In addition, the Council is working jointly with other Suffolk Authorities to provide a number of short stay stopping places across the county to meet identified needs.</p>	<p>New paragraph setting out the SCDC position in regards to gypsies &amp; travellers included in the introduction section.</p>
6998 - Hopkins Homes (Mr Robert Eburne) [2704]	Object	The plan text misrepresents the core strategy policy on housing mix and seeks to be less flexible without justification	<p>The wording is considered to reflect the approach currently adopted by the Council when considering planning applications. The starting point is the table in the Core Strategy, however through pre-application discussions with parish/town councils it is expected that local views will be taken into consideration.</p>	No change
<i>Delete paragraph 2.17</i>				
6877 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Support	It is vitally important that a full mix of accommodation types are provided	Support noted.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>2.18</b>				
7186 - Taylor Wimpey [2902]	Comment	Additional appropriate sites should be allocated within the Site Allocations Document in order to be in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF. The NPPF does not preclude additional sites being allocated in a site allocations document and as such the Site Allocations Document is not mutually exclusive with the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan. The representations submitted to the Issues and Options Consultation detailed the appropriateness of Land east of Fairfield Road, Framlingham to form an allocation within the Site Allocations Document and this position is maintained and strengthened by virtue of the reasons outlined in these representations.	The Site Allocations Document, neighbourhood plans and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan will together provide for a minimum of 7,900 new homes, the housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The Site Allocations Document includes in policy SSP1 a minimum housing requirement to be provided in each designated neighbourhood plan area - neighbourhood plan groups are working to secure these minimum figures through the plan. The appropriateness of land east of Fairfield Road as a housing site is being determined through the current planning appeal. It is a site which was considered but rejected in favour of other sites through the neighbourhood plan process.	No change
7025 - Christchurch Property Company Limited [2980]	Support	Land at Yarmouth Road Melton should be allocated in the Site Allocations document, as it constitutes sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The site should be a preferred option for housing being a sustainable and appropriate option for the village of Melton, which is significantly constrained by Conservation Area designations and so on.	This site lies within the parish of Melton for which a neighbourhood plan is being prepared which includes provision of new housing.	No change
<b>Preferred Option SSP3 - Land rear of Rose Hill, Saxmundham Road, Aldeburgh</b>				
7352 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	Anglian Water has no objection to the proposed allocation of this site for open market housing and a care home.	Comment noted.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7017 - Aldeburgh Golf Club [3341]	Comment	The Golf Club owns the land to the west needed to provide the necessary road widening and would welcome the opportunity of discussing what highway improvements are needed at this point which could tie in with its own aspiration to provide a safer junction at this point.	Comment noted. Information contained confirms improved access provision is possible and the need for any junction improvements to meet the needs of both the new residents and the golf club. The detail of any scheme is more appropriately dealt with at the planning application stage.	Amend paragraph 2.24 to read "This site to the rear of Rose Hill is 3ha in size. It is fairly regular in shape with existing low density residential development on three sides. The site is accessed via a track running north direct onto Saxmundham Road which forms the western boundary to the site and which would need to be widened to bring it up to standard. The track is in the ownership of the Aldeburgh Golf Club who have confirmed that improvements to this junction would also meet with their aspirations to provide a safer junction at this point."
7695 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SCC confirm site is close to a Bronze-Age occupation site and it is in a topographically favourable location on higher ground overlooking the River Alde. Prehistoric, Saxon and Iron Age remains are recorded from the golf course. It is close to World War II features. The site should be subject to assessment to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of importance that might be defined and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. It may be part of a band of activity along the river valley. Geophysical survey would be appropriate in the first instance.	Comments noted	Add new paragraph before policy to read: Suffolk County Council - archaeology note that the site is close to a Bronze Age occupation site, prehistoric, Saxon and Iron Age remains have been recorded from the golf course and that it is also close to World War II features. Given this rich history, an archaeological assessment will therefore be required at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for in situ preservation if appropriate.
		<i>The site should be subject to assessment at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. It may be part of a band of activity along the river valley. Geophysical survey would be appropriate in the first instance</i>		Add new bullet point to policy SSP3 "An archaeological assessment will be required at an early stage in the design process.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6817 - RSPB (Jacqui Miller) [2839]	Comment	<p>We have previously raised concerns (in our response of 26th February 2015 to the Issues and Options consultation) about this site regarding its proximity to the Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and Ramsar site, however, this was on the basis of 69-108 houses. A reduction to ten houses plus a care home may reduce concerns, but this restriction should be clearly worded (as an upper limit) into the resulting policy (SSP3). At present it is not clear whether the requirement is for less than ten units (as in the excerpt from the Sustainability Appraisal) or 'around ten' as in para. 2.23.</p>	<p>This comment is similar to that received from Natural England who require specific reference to be added to the policy requiring an HRA screening. Additional reference could usefully be included within the supporting text to reflect the importance of the nature conservation interest of the Alde Ore estuary.</p> <p>The policy and supporting text refer to "approximately 10" new homes. The exact number will be a matter for the detailed planning application stage.</p>	<p>Amend policy SSP3 to read "3ha of land ..... for approximately 10 units. Applications for development of this site will need to be subject to an HRA screening. Any development which would result in significant adverse effects which could not be appropriately mitigated will not be permitted. In addition, development will need to be in accordance with the following criteria.."</p> <p>Amend paragraph 2.20 "... The Alde and Ore estuary is a designated Special Protection Area and Ramsar site and thereby acknowledged to be of international importance for its nature conservation interest. The older part of the town.."</p>
7341 - Natural England (Sir/ Madam) [2516]	Comment	<p>The site is about 300m from Alde-Ore Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA)/Ramsar site and Alde-Ore and Butley Estuaries Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The avoidance of strategic housing proposals at Martlesham and at Felixstowe Peninsula within 1km of the Deben Estuary and Orwell Estuary respectively has been proposed as mitigation in part for adverse effects arising from increased recreational disturbance. Preferred Option SSP3 is within 1km of the Alde-Ore Estuary and therefore we advise that it would be required to have a Habitats Regulations Assessment at the application stage.</p>	Comment noted	<p>Amend paragraph 2.20 to read "... risk zones. The Alde and Ore estuary is a designated Special Protection Area and Ramsar site and thereby acknowledged to be of international importance for its nature conservation interest..."</p> <p>Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.25 "Natural England have also confirmed that given the location of the site is within 300m of the Alde and Ore Estuary a habitats regulation assessment will be required at the planning application stage</p>
7621 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>SSP3 Primary school is forecast to be at or slightly above total capacity of 105 dwellings for the forecast period. However, given the small number of pupils arising from 10 new units it is envisaged they can be absorbed at the school. CIL contributions may be sought to help remodel school should it be necessary to cope with these additional pupils.</p>	Comment noted.	No change

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
7404 - M.S. Oakes Ltd [3958]	Object	<p>Will only deliver 10 dwellings plus a care home on 3 H.A (in essence appears to be an inefficient use of site)-no explicit details as to capacity of care home nor how it will be operated. Limited scope to provide Affordable Housing. Not previously developed land. Report by Kingdom Transportation and Highway Consultants highlights both the highway based problems associated with the Rose Hill site and the merits of the Brickfields site.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The provision of a care home has not been explored in detail with care home providers however, Aldeburgh has one of the oldest populations in the district and the need for such provision is supported by the Town Council. The provision of a care home will potentially free up existing housing stock within the town. The care home and the limited market housing element will have more limited impact on the Alde and Ore SPA than a higher density pure housing scheme. Information from the Golf Club has confirmed that the necessary improvements to the highway access can be achieved. The site is visually much less intrusive than the neighbouring brickworks site</p>	No change
7411 - Bidwells (Laura Hunter) [3941]	Object	<p>It is unclear whether an adequate access to the public highway can be provided and, moreover, the site is poorly integrated with the wider settlement and poorly connected to local services. Saxmundham Road provides an unsympathetic environment for pedestrians and cyclists and there are no convenient alternative routes. All of these factors suggest that development in this location would isolate residents from the town and only encourage a reliance on private car use, which would be unsustainable.</p> <p><i>Delete Preferred Option SSP3, unless evidence is presented to demonstrate that the site is genuinely developable and sustainable.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. The Golf Course have confirmed that the opportunity exists to improve the access to the site as required and also that it could incorporate improvements which the Golf Club would wish to see at this point to improve highway safety for their members. Disagree that Saxmundham Road is any less a sympathetic environment for pedestrians and cyclists than many other roads around the district.</p>	No change
7029 - Aldeburgh Society (Mr Tony Bone) [3834]	Support	<p>The Society supports the allocation together with all the stated provisos, which can be negotiated into any scheme, or included in conditions, in the event of a planning application being submitted and considered. The Society feels that landscaping of any development on this site will be important so that any visual impact on the entrance to the town is minimised.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7474 - Mrs G M Bailey [4000]	Support	<p>The proposal for a mixed development consisting of a care home and up to 10 open market housing units would, in my view, represent an appropriate and sensitive use of the site and it has my support.</p> <p>Reference is made in 2.24 to the access track and that it would need to be widened, although there is no reference to it in SSP3. Also in 2.24 that the track "forms the western boundary". The track lies outside the revised physical limits shown on the map and to provide an access of sufficient width it may need to be widened.</p>	Support noted	Add additional bullet point to policy SSP3 to read: improvements to the access track to provide a satisfactory means of access for the development and improved access at the junction with Saxmundham Road for the benefit and safety of golfers using Aldeburgh Golf Club.
<b>Alternative Option</b>				
7405 - M.S. Oakes Ltd [3958]	Object	<p>The summary more visually intrusive from south ignores the development presently under construction (Phase 2 ) which effectively means that Brickfields is bounded by existing development to the north and west and phase 2 to the south west.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reference to access and impact of street lights. As indicated in the planning application any external lighting will be low level and discrete</li> <li>- In addition Rosehill appears to be closer to the RAMSAR site than Brickfields</li> </ul>	Comments noted. The difference in scale of this development will result in greater impact than that suggested for Rose Hill. The configuration of Rose Hill means that the street lighting will be less intrusive whether or not it is a low level and discrete. Both sites are close to the Alde and Ore estuary so would require a habitats regulations assessment to assess potential impact and identify any necessary mitigation measures. It is also noted that this site is the subject of a current planning application. The points raised are ones which the supporting documentation to that planning application will need to address in greater detail than would be expected through this site allocations document.	No change
7412 - Bidwells (Laura Hunter) [3941]	Object	Agree with the Councils decision to reject the brickworks site.. It is in a particularly exposed location at higher ground levels than the rest of the surrounding AONB, as shown in the photograph below, and its development would lead to considerable harm to the natural beauty of the area.	Support noted	No change

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action	
2.26	6558 - Mrs Tanya Newton [3681]	Support	Offer some units as self build, for sustainable eco friendly homes, for local young people.	Comment noted. This is the only site identified for new housing in Badingham. If there is an identified need which has the support of the Parish Council, then a self-build or low cost market housing scheme could be an option on this site.	Amend paragraph 2.27 "... in keeping with the character of the village and adjacent dwellings. Should a need be identified, and subject to the support of the Parish Council, this site could be suitable for a self-build or low cost market housing scheme."
2.28	7353 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	<p>Reference is made to the need for the surface water network capacity being increased based upon comments previously made by Anglian Water. Connections should only be made to the surface water sewer network only where it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of Anglian Water that suitable alternatives are not practicable. Anglian Water would not accept a surface water connection to the foul (only) sewerage network under any circumstances</p> <p><i>Para 2.28 should be amended to refer to the management of surface water run off in accordance with the surface water management hierarchy.</i></p>	Comment noted. Additional clarification to be provided.	Amend paragraph 2.28 to read "Anglian Water have confirmed that the surface water network capacity would need to be increased as part of any scheme. Surface water management is the responsibility of the County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority. Any development scheme will therefore be expected to ensure that the management of surface water run off is undertaken in accordance with the surface water management hierarchy."
<i>Preferred Option SSP4 Land at Mill Road Badingham</i>					
7645 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SCC confirm Dennington primary school has sufficient capacity	Comment noted	No change	
7696 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SCC confirm no objection in principle but that there is high potential for important archaeological remains to be defined at this location, given the proximity to known remains. It would require a planning condition under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation.	Comments noted.	Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.28 to read: Suffolk County Council - Archaeology note that this site lies within an area of high archaeological importance, but that the area has not been the subject of systematic archaeological investigation. There is therefore a high potential for important archaeological remains to be defined at this location. An archaeological investigation will therefore be required.	
				Add new paragraph to policy SSP4: "An archaeological investigation will be required	

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7354 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	No objection from Anglian Water	Comment noted	No change
6976 - Badingham Parish Council (Mrs S Piggott) [2646]	Support	Conditional support from Parish Council can only support a mix of housing stock that includes Low Cost housing and Shared Ownership houses, this will meet the demand of those on low incomes who wish to buy their own house	Comment noted. Amendment suggested to supporting text which includes reference to self-build as well as low cost market housing.	Amend paragraph 2.27 "... in keeping with the character of the village and adjacent dwellings. Should a need be identified, and subject to the support of the Parish Council, this site could be suitable for a self-build or low cost market housing scheme."
7007 - Evolution Town Planning (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [3055]	Support	<p>Supports policy.</p> <p>Amendment suggested that the allocations include some land adjacent to the eastern boundary of the park to facilitate access to the pocket park in the future.</p> <p>The site is unconstrained and immediately available.</p> <p><i>Amend site allocation to include additional land to provide access to the pocket park</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. The land required to provide access to the pocket park is within the control of the site promoter. An amendment to the site area would enable direct access to this local facility.</p>	<p>Amend site area to enable access to the pocket park direct from the site allocation.</p> <p>Amend Policy SSP4 bullet point 5 to read "Any proposed development scheme should make provision for direct access from the proposed new housing to the existing pocket park"</p>
2.29				
6659 - Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council (Mrs Melanie Thurston) [3640]	Object	<p>We do not agree with the wording of para. 2.9, which makes the village sound more compact and sustainable than it is. The truth is that access to Saxmundham is dangerous (there have been fatalities to cyclists); the church is 1.5 miles from the village centre and across a dual carriageway road; there is not a community run pub; the farm shop sells locally grown produce only.</p> <p>This is not a foundation for expansion.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Benhall may not have a full range of facilities, but does have some such as the primary school and farm shop. It is close to Saxmundham a market town. The proposal for a single site to accommodate a small number of homes is not considered to be inappropriate in terms of scale to the existing settlement. Comments regarding access are noted however there is no objection to the development of this site from the highway authority on the basis of a single access and suitable sight lines being provided</p>	No change
6755 - Mrs Wendy Mannall [3787]	Support	I agree that Benhall is in a sustainable location and benefits from its close proximity to Saxmundham.	Support noted.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>	
2.32	7355 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	<p>Reference is made to the need for the surface water network capacity being increased based upon comments previously made by Anglian Water. Connections should only be made to the surface water sewer network only where it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of Anglian Water that suitable alternatives are not practicable. It is important to note that we would not accept a surface water connection to the foul (only) sewerage network under any circumstances.</p>	Comments noted	<p>Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.33 to read: Anglian Water have confirmed that the surface water network capacity would need to be increased. Surface water management is the responsibility of the County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority. Any development scheme will therefore be expected to ensure that the management of surface water run off is undertaken in accordance with the surface water management hierarchy.</p>
2.33	6756 - Mrs Wendy Mannall [3787]	Object	<p>Object to the proposal for a small estate type development in a very prominent position at the entrance to Benhall. This land is part of a larger green field area which is and has been actively farmed for many years. It is not well related to the village and would spoil the approach to Benhall.</p>	<p><i>para 2.32 should be amended to refer to the management of surface water run off in accordance with the surface water management hierarchy.</i></p>	No change
6946 - Mr Paul Mannall [3855]	Object	<p>This site is the first glimpse of Benhall when approaching over the railway bridge from the A12, building here would give an urban feel to an essentially rural village changing the face of the village for ever and setting a precedent for development of the wider field.</p>	<p><i>Integrate dwelling within the existing settlement .</i></p> <p><i>Comments noted. The sensitivities of this site are already picked up in the policy through the requirement for suitable planting to the southern boundary where it borders the open countryside beyond, and by limiting the extent of the site to align with that of the neighbouring residential properties.</i></p>	No change	
<i>Removal of the site from the plan</i>					

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<i>Preferred Option SSP5 - Land south of Brook Cottage, Benhall</i>				
7356 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	Anglian Water has no objection to the proposed allocation of this site for residential development.	Comment noted	No change
7697 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>This site lies in an area of archaeological potential recorded in the County Historic Environment Record, on the edge of the historic settlement surrounding Benhall Green (County Historic Environment Record BNL 030) and within the valley of the River Fromus.</p> <p>No objection in principle but it would require a planning condition under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation.</p>	Comment noted	<p>Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.33: Suffolk County Council - Archaeology note that the site lies within an area of archaeological potential and therefore an archaeological investigation should be carried out.</p>
7636 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>Saxmundham primary school is forecast to be over capacity throughout the five yr period. Given history of pupils from Saxmundham attending primary schools at Benhall and Kelsale and vice versa the schools and development within their catchments is considered collectively.</p>	Issue with possible lack of school places noted.	<p>Add new paragraph after 2.33 to read: "Suffolk County Council has indicated that across the three local primary schools Benhall, Kelsale and Saxmundham, there may not be capacity to accommodate additional pupils from allocated sites over the period to 2020. Infrastructure issues will need to be addressed, so the site may not be able to come forward for development until later in the plan period."</p>
6642 - Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council (Dr Hilary Graham) [3427]	Object	<p>We believed that the proposed new physical boundary had been agreed between us, as had the allocation of new housing to be required from Benhall as zero. Both of these agreed policies have been completely ignored and a new physical boundary proposed with further allocations of housing requirements. At no stage have either of these new policies been discussed with the Parish Council.</p>	<p>The plan specifically references the fact that the Parish Council do not see a need for development at this time. However, this is a small site which is considered suitable for additional housing provision and Benhall is an identified Local Service Centre located close to Saxmundham a market town. The size and location of the site is not considered to be out of keeping with either the size or built form of Benhall. Elsewhere, the physical limits boundary for Benhall reflects early discussions with the Parish Council. The site was identified as potentially suitable for housing in the SHLAA and consulted on at the Issues and Options consultation stage. The removal of policy SSP6 from the plan means that the number of units suggested for Benhall has reduced accordingly</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6660 - Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council (Mrs Melanie Thurston) [3640]	Object	<p>This land has been the subject of informal discussions with officers. However, given that the parish has been forced to accept 21 residential properties in the countryside at the Whitearch Camp Site, we consider it unreasonable and inappropriate to add this (adjacent) open countryside to the parish envelope. This would be tantamount to punishing the parish for the errors of the planning officers.</p>	<p>The planning permission for Whitearch Camp site is for holiday accommodation on a holiday park. The units are not subject to a seasonal occupancy condition, but as holiday units are not part of the monitored housing stock. The housing figures provided for Benhall in Table 2 are therefore correct.</p>	No change
6695 - Mr Peter Phillips [3759]	Object	<p>Publicity of the consultation needs to improve, more local people should be directly informed of proposals. The road alignment from the A12 makes visibility of the traffic difficult. The view of traffic approaching from both Saxmundham and Benhall High Street is restricted.</p> <p>On SSP5 2.29 you state Benhall has a Community Run Pub. This is not correct. Benhall Club is privately owned and you have to be a member in order enter. The word Community Run Pub should therefore be deleted in future when describing Benhall as a local service centre.</p>	<p>The suggestion for improved consultation direct with local people is noted. The highway authority raise no objection to the development of the site as suggested i.e with a single point of access and adequate sight lines.</p> <p>The correction with regard to the reference to the community run pub is noted.</p>	Amend paragraph 2.29 to read "...primary school, church and farm shop..."
6956 - Mr Ian Rix [3185]	Support	Supports development of this site but sees no reason to delay its development	<p>Support noted. The reference to phasing reflects the local community view that new housing is not required at this time. It is noted however that new housing can only be phased where there is an issue with infrastructure provision. The current lack of primary school places may be such an issue.</p>	No change

### *Sustainability Appraisals Information*

6630 - Mr Cyril Fidler [3736]	Object	<p>Observation. If indeed 'significant positive effects of developing this site, relating to health and transport' can be established then they must surely apply to the village as a whole.</p> <p>This site is no closer to the facilities in Saxmundham than Festival Close when accessed on foot or bicycle via school Lane.</p> <p><i>Observation only.</i></p>	Comment noted	No change
-------------------------------	--------	--	---------------	-----------

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
6758 - Mrs Wendy Mannall [3787]	Object	<p>The development of the site would mean the loss of a productive greenfield site. This site significantly impacts on the street scene/village landscape. Looking at various proposed boundary changes it would seem the easy option is to bolt on a mini estate.</p>	<p>In order to achieve the housing requirement set out in the Core Strategy, the majority of new development sites will need to be provided for on green field sites. This site is small and well related to the existing form of the village, the boundary does not extend beyond that of the existing built area of development and the policy requires landscaping, reflecting the fact that the southern boundary will border open countryside and is a sensitive edge of settlement site.</p> <p>Opportunities for small infill development are provided for elsewhere in the village where they can be accommodated within the physical limits boundary.</p>	No change
<i>If this quantity of housing is indeed required look at providing plots for 1 or 2 dwellings in various locations within the village rather than estate type development.</i>				
2.34		6762 - Mrs Wendy Mannall [3787] Object	Site poorly related and on a blind bend	Comment noted. The landowner has confirmed that this site is not available for development.
<i>Do not develop this site.</i>				
<b>Preferred Option SSP6 - Land south of Brook Cottage, Benhall</b>			Comment noted. The landowner has confirmed that this site is not available for development.	Delete policy SSP6 and associated text from plan
7641 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	strategy is in place to provide places for children expected from homes with extant planning permission in the catchment of the three schools. Some limited capacity remains which can, in theory be used to accept proposed new growth. SCC cannot guarantee that all pupils from proposed growth will be able to find a place at local schools. It may not be possible to mitigate further housing growth from windfall. The next Local Plan could look to allocated sufficient new housing to make a new primary school sustainable.		Delete policy SSP6 and associated text from plan
7357 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	No objection	Comment noted. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for development.	Delete policy SSP6 and associated text from plan

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7698 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	This site is in a topographically favourable location for early activity overlooking the River Fromus. No objection in principle but it will require a planning condition under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation.	Comment noted. This site is to be deleted from the plan as the landowner has confirmed it not available	No change
7637 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Saxmundham primary school is forecast to be over capacity throughout the five yr period. Given history of pupils from Saxmundham attending primary schools at Benhall and Kelsale and vice versa the schools and development within their catchments is considered collectively.	Comment noted. The landowner has confirmed that this site is not available for development.	Delete policy SSP6 and associated text from plan
6643 - Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council (Dr Hilary Graham) [3427]	Object	We believed that the proposed new physical boundary had been agreed with the parish council as had the allocation of new housing to be required from Benhall as zero. Both of these agreed policies have been completely ignored and a new physical boundary proposed with further allocations of housing requirements. At no stage have either of these new policies been discussed with the Parish Council  <i>Amend physical limits boundary to delete SSP6</i>	Comments noted. Site SSP6 is no longer available and is to be deleted from the plan.	Delete policy SSP6 and associated text from the plan
6696 - Mrs G Fry [3757]	Object	Consultation should have been more widely advertised. Highway access difficult and dangerous.	Comment noted. The landowner has confirmed that this site is not available for development.	Delete SSP6 and associated text from plan
6828 - MR Alan Picchi [3822]	Object	Required sight visibility splays could not be achieved. Access is onto blind bend on 40mph speed limit. In addition to the bats, it is believed crested newts inhabit the watercourse. This strip of land represents the only safe route for wildlife migrating east to west of the village  <i>Additional reference to traffic calming measures to restrict speeds to 20mph and the buildings within the sight splay demolished; to need to relocate newts; and archaeological survey.</i>	Comment noted. The landowner has confirmed that this site is not available for development.	Delete SSP6 and associated text from plan

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6892 - MR Alan Picchi [3822]	Object	I was assured by the land owner of site SSP6 that the council had advised her that her land would be removed from the local plan. However, it still seems to be included. The Highway assessment for access to the site has not been fully considered and was only undertaken as a desk top exercise.	Comment noted. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for development.	Delete policy SSP6 and associated text from plan
6694 - Mr Peter Phillips [3759]	Object	Access dangerous and difficult. Community pub only accessible if you are a member	Comment noted. The landowner has confirmed that this site is not available for development.	Delete SSP6 and associated text from plan.
7107 - Mr Michael Upson [3853]	Object	Difficult and dangerous access. Any development would ruin the unique, semi-rural charm of the area. The infrastructure would not support a larger population, the only local amenities are the primary school and the Working Man's Club.	Comment noted. The landowner has confirmed that this site is not available for development.	Delete policy SSP6 and associated text from plan
6661 - Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council (Mrs Melanie Thurston) [3640]	Object	Site unsuitable due to dangerous access. Site owner not happy.	Comment noted. The site owner has confirmed that this site is not available for development.	Delete policy SSP6 and associated text from plan
		<i>Remove site from plan as unsuitable</i>		
6556 - Mrs Caroline Rinder [3674]	Object	Confirmation that the landowner is not interested in selling the land. The site was put forward without her consent or knowledge.	Comment noted. This site is no longer available so will be deleted from the plan.	Delete Policy SSP6 and supporting text from plan
		<i>Remove this area of land from the plan</i>		
<b>Sustainability Appraisal Information</b>				
6632 - Mr Cyril Fidler [3736]	Object	Foot access for this site via the playing field is key due to the location and vehicular access situated on a bend on the B1121 (old A12)  <i>Observation only.</i>	Comment noted. The landowner has confirmed that this site is not available for development.	Delete policy SSP6 and associated text from plan

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
2.35				
<b>7358 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]</b>				
7358 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	Additional clarification provided from Anglian Water re the management of the surface water network. They note "we would not accept a surface water connection to the foul (only) sewerage network under any circumstances"	Comment noted.	Amend paragraph 2.35 to read "Anglian Water have confirmed that the surface water network capacity would need to be increased as part of any scheme. Surface water management is the responsibility of the County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority. Any development scheme will therefore be expected to ensure that the management of surface water run off is undertaken in accordance with the surface water management hierarchy."
		<i>Amend para 2.35 to refer to the management of surface water run off in accordance with the surface water management hierarchy.</i>		
<b>Preferred Option SSP7 Land south of Ambleside, Main Road, Kelsale cum Carlton</b>				
7700 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SCC - Archaeology confirm no objection in principle but the site lies on a valley side, and Iron Age and Late Saxon/Medieval features were recorded to the south (County Historic Environment Record DNN 047). It will require a planning condition under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation	Comments noted. (note responses refer to correct policy number but should read Dennington not Kelsale)	Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.35 to read: Suffolk County Council - Archaeology confirm no objection in principle but that Iron Age and Late Saxon/Medieval features were recorded to the south (County Historic Environment Record DNN 047). An archaeological investigation will therefore be required.
				<i>Add new bullet point to policy SSP7 "An archaeological investigation</i>
7646 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SCC confirm Dennington has sufficient primary school capacity	Comment noted	No change

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
2.40				
<b>7360 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]</b>				
Comment		Reference is made to the need for the surface water network capacity. It is important to note that Anglian Water would not accept a surface water connection to the foul (only) sewerage network under any circumstances.	Comment noted.	Amend paragraph 2.40 to read "The allocation site is not subject to any constraints other in relation to the surface water network. However there are views across the site from the village and a carefully designed scheme could retain some of those views. With regard to surface water Anglian Water have confirmed that the surface water network capacity would need to be increased as part of any scheme. Surface water management is the responsibility of the County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority. Any development scheme will therefore be expected to ensure that the management of surface water run off is undertaken in accordance with the surface water management hierarchy."
		<i>para 2.40 should be amended to refer to the management of surface water run off in accordance with the surface water management hierarchy</i>		
<b>Preferred Option SSP8 Land south of Ambleside, Main Road, Kelsale cum Carlton</b>				
7359 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	No objection from Anglian Water	Comment noted	No change
<b>7699 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]</b>				
Comment		SCC Archaeology confirm that the site has not been systematically investigated for archaeological remains but that it is in a topographically favourable valley side location, close to the historic core of settlement. A site assessment will be required at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.	Comments noted	Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.40 to read: Suffolk County Council - Archaeology note that the site has not been systematically investigated archaeological remains, but that it is located in a topographically favourable valley side location close to the historic core of the settlement. An archaeological investigation will therefore be required at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for in situ preservation if appropriate.
				Add new bullet point to policy SSP8: An archaeological investigation will be required

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7115 - Hopkins Homes [551]	Comment	<p>The site has capacity to provide in excess of the 20 units suggested given the varied character and density of development to the west</p> <p><i>1.86ha of land south of Ambleside, Main Road Kelsale cum Carlton is identified for residential use as shown on the Policies Map for a minimum of 20 units with a higher quantum of development appropriate subject to appropriate design and layout</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. The suggested amendment would incorporate the wording from paragraph 2.39 into the policy. Viability evidence has indicated that the number of units should be increased to approximately 30.</p>	<p>Amend policy SSP8 to read "1.86ha of land south of Ambleside, Main Road Kelsale cum Carlton is identified for residential use as shown on the Policies Map for approximately 30 units with a higher quantum of development appropriate subject to appropriate design and layout. Applicants will ...."</p>
7361 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	Anglian Water confirm no objection	Comment noted	No change
7638 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581] 7642 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>Saxmundham primary school is forecast to be over capacity throughout the five yr period. However provision is jointly considered with schools at Benhall and Kelsale.</p> <p>A strategy is in place to provide places for children expected from homes with extant planning permission in the catchment of the three schools. Some limited capacity remains which can, in theory be used to accept proposed new growth. SCC cannot guarantee that all pupils from proposed growth will be able to find a place at local schools. It may not be possible to mitigate further housing growth from windfall. The next Local Plan could look to allocated sufficient new housing to make a new primary school sustainable.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The provision of primary education in this part of the district is becoming an issue and will be addressed as part of the Local Plan Review in conjunction with SCC Education. In relation to this plan, the only impact is in relation to possible phasing. This is a matter more appropriately addressed at the planning application stage.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 2.40 to read "In terms of physical constraints, the allocation...those views. Suffolk County Council have indicated that the provision of primary education places locally may be an issue over the period to 2020. Infrastructure issues will need to be addressed, so the site may not be able to come forward for development until later in the plan period."</p>

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
7176 - Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council (Mrs Joanne Jones) [2838]	Comment	<p>The Parish Council is disappointed that the number has increased to 20. However if this is to be the preferred site it was agreed the type of suitable housing should be as follows:</p> <p>single storey dwellings to allow older residents to move into alternative, more suitable accommodation within the village.</p> <p>2 or 3 bedroomed houses.</p> <p>affordable homes to either rent or buy to enable young people to stay within the village</p> <p><i>There was also preference from some members to allow these dwellings to be built over a wider area, fitting in with existing developments, thus 'blending' more with the existing structure? This would also ensure the dwellings are all slightly different, not a standard development of a large number of very similar buildings, and thus appears to be more 'organic' growth rather than an urban type development, and thus more suitable to our precious rural identity.</i></p> <p><i>It was also felt that by spreading out the building plots with fewer units on each it would generate work for smaller local building companies.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. It is important to make best use of land which is allocated for housing. Consideration also needs to be given to issues of site viability whilst still providing a scheme which appropriate in the context of local circumstance. The text already refers to the varied character and density of development in the vicinity of the site. Detailed comments on matters such as plot size and standard building types are more appropriately considered at the planning application stage.</p>	<p>Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.39 " The Parish Council have indicated a need for a mix of dwellings across the site to meet the needs particularly of older and younger residents wishing to remain local and which would be available to buy or rent.</p>
6706 - Mr T R & Mrs J R Bloomfield [3701]	Support	Support for the inclusion of the site in the plan	Comment noted	No change

## 2.46

7362 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	<p>Reference is made to the need for the surface water network capacity being increased based upon comments previously made by Anglian Water. It is important to note that Anglian Water will not accept a surface water connection to the foul (only) sewerage network under any circumstances.</p> <p><i>para 2.46 should be amended to refer to the management of surface water run off in accordance with the surface water management hierarchy.</i></p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 2.46 to read "Anglian Water have confirmed that the surface water network capacity would need to be increased as part of any scheme. Surface water management is the responsibility of the County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority. Any development scheme will therefore be expected to ensure that the management of surface water run off is undertaken in accordance with the surface water management hierarchy."</p>
---	---------	---	-----------------------	--

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<i>Preferred Option SSP9 Land north of Mill Close, Orford</i>				
7622 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SCC confirm current forecasts indicate that Orford Primary School has sufficient spare capacity to absorb the proposed growth.	Comment noted	No change
7623 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SCC confirm sufficient spare capacity exists	Comment noted	No change
7363 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	It is expected that there may be a need for improvements to the sewerage treatment capacity to enable the development of this site	Comment noted	<p>Amend paragraph 2.46 to read: Anglian Water have advised that development of this site may require improvements to the sewerage treatment capacity. The extent of any improvements will need to be assessed through discussion between the developer and Anglian Water ahead of any planning application being submitted to the District Council.</p> <p>Amend policy SSP9 'Developers will need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available'</p>
7701 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SCC confirm this site is close to a possible mound and the site of a windmill depicted on a plan of c1600 (ORF 019) as well as other archaeological finds. They recommend the site should be subject to assessment at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate.	Comments noted	<p>Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.46 to read: Suffolk County Council - Archaeology note that the site is close to a possible mound and site of a windmill, depicted on a plan of around 1600 and that archaeological finds, particularly of medieval date have been recorded in the area. An archaeological investigation will therefore be required at an appropriate stage to allow for in-situ preservation if appropriate.</p> <p>Add new bullet to policy SSP9 to read: An archaeological investigation will be required</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7488 - R & S Smith [4012]	Object	<p>The suggested development would be detrimental to the village as a whole.</p> <p>There have been two recent housing sites in this area. More building here is changing the nature and face of the village and creating separate areas of old and new, destroying a harmonious blend.</p>	Comments noted. There is a need to provide additional housing across the district. Orford is a sustainable settlement with limited opportunities for growth. There is already a clear distinction between the older and new parts of the village. It is considered that a well designed scheme as required by the policy would not detract from the character of the area.	No change
6792 - Mr & Mrs J & P Donnelly [3799]	Object	<p>If there is a need for more housing for local needs it must be affordable and of good progressive design not like Mill Close. Major development in the AONB is against existing policies and this proposal for up to 10 houses would therefore be against the existing Policies to protect the AONB.</p> <p>If a scheme is to go ahead it should be the subject of an architectural design competition. Access to the site from Ipswich Road which is likely to be dangerous</p>	Comments noted. Orford is a sustainable settlement with the opportunity to contribute to new housing provision across the district. The policy already requires a high quality scheme in recognition of the fact that it is a sensitive site and within the AONB. In relation to the AONB, a development of this scale is not considered major. In relation to advice in the NPPF developments such as Sizewell power station would be considered major.	No change
2.47	Comment	<p>7291 - Fletcher Barton Ltd (Mr William Barton) [3482]</p> <p>This Key Service Centre is "altogether larger, and contains a much wider variety of facilities than is common in most Key Service Centres" (Page 41 sect 2.47). Bearing in mind the Parish Council desire to sustain the village centre facilities, the proximity of Bentwaters Park offering significant employment opportunities as well as the Rendlesham Mews site, we suggest that Rendlesham is capable of accommodating a large scale housing allocation more in tune with the "Market Towns". Para 2.47 should be amended to state this.</p> <p><i>Amend paragraph 2.47 to state that Rendlesham is capable of accommodating a large scale housing allocation more in tune with the Market Towns.</i></p>	Comment noted. Further growth at Rendlesham above that proposed in the plan is constrained by a number of factors, but particularly the capacity of the local road network.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>2.51</b>	7292 - Fletcher Barton Ltd (Mr William Barton) [3482]	Comment Section 2.51 also shows that Rendlesham has the capacity to accommodate more than the 100 homes proposed. The village could accommodate significantly more than this number, and that other well located sites could provide large scale housing schemes, such as the site shown as attached to the north & east of Redwald Road.	Comment noted. Rendlesham is subject to a number of constraints however it is the potential cumulative impact of additional traffic onto the local road network through to the A12 which is the main constraint.	No change but see new policy SSP13 land east of Redwald Road, Rendlesham
<b>2.52</b>	7293 - Fletcher Barton Ltd (Mr William Barton) [3482]	Comment Paragraph 2.52 should be amended to state "Three sites are identified as suitable for large scale housing schemes which together could provide significantly in excess of the 100 homes required. Development could be provided on a mixture of the sites as they become available during the plan lifetime"	The reference to a third site is to the inclusion of a reference to this objectors site to the north and east of Raedwald Road. Whilst the Council is now recommending that the land to the north of Suffolk Drive is deleted from the plan and that an alternative area of land off Raedwald Road should take its place, the reference in paragraph 2.52 to two sites remains correct as does the reference to the quantum of housing.	No change
<p><i>Paragraph 2.52 should be amended to state "Three sites are identified as suitable for large scale housing schemes which together could provide significantly in excess of the 100 homes required. Development could be provided on a mixture of the sites as they become available during the plan lifetime"</i></p>				
<b>Preferred Option SSP10 Land west of Garden Square Rendlesham</b>	6914 - Mr Richard Kevern [3841]	Comment Supports policy and reduction in numbers to 50 or fewer.	Comments noted	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7612 - Sarah-Jane Quick [3962]	Comment	Cumulative development in these more rural areas increases the traffic volume requiring to clear the roundabout at Wilford Bridge, Melton rail crossing & traffic lights - with the concomitant impact on Air Quality in Melton and in Woodbridge. There is land by Rockford House which would more sensibly be developed as it is closer to the road than either SSP10 or SSP11	Comments noted. The cumulative impact of traffic from Rendlesham and elsewhere on the local road network to the junction with the A12 has been factored into the plan. It is impact on the local road network which is a primary reason for limiting the numbers of new homes proposed for Rendlesham. Reference to air quality is already included within Policy SSP10.	No change
6623 - Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC Environmental Protection) [2963]	Comment	Indicator Number 10 of the Sustainability appraisal (to maintain and where possible improve air quality) needs to be recorded as minor negative '-' and not neutral 'o' as there will be additional emissions from vehicles associated with this site.	Agree. The SA scoring ribbons will be removed in the Publication draft of the DPD but the amendment will be made to the scoring in the Final SA Report.	Amend SA score for policy SSP10, indicator 10 to read: '-' (minor negative)
7486 - Residents of Garden Square & Gardenia Close (Sir/ Madam) [4010] 7491 - Mr Thomas Dyball [4015]	Comment	Support policy SSP10 and the reduction in numbers from 75 to 50	Support noted	No change
7364 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	Anglian Water confirm that it is expected that there will be a need for improvements to the foul sewerage network to enable the development of this site.	Comments noted	Amend paragraph 2.54 to read: "... The number of homes and the area on which development could take place has therefore been reduced to approximately 50. Anglian Water have also confirmed that it is expected that there will be need for improvements to the foul sewerage network. Land not suitable ..." Add new bullet point to policy SSP10 to read: "The development will need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available";

*the following text should be include in Policy SSP10  
Need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the  
foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made  
available'*

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7492 - Tom Griffith-Jones [4016]	Comment	Both these policies relate to the need and/or opportunity for further development of residential properties in Rendlesham. Both sites are suitable for development, and could accommodate more but higher densities would not be appropriate. It is important that the development is spread out across both sites, as low density developments. Obviously this cannot happen in the cordon sanitaire near the sewage treatment plant on the northern site, but it can elsewhere.	Comments noted. It will be for the detailed planning application stage to determine the exact extent and range of density for the area of built development on each housing site. Note SSP11 is to be deleted from the plan to be replaced with a new site on Raedwald Road.	No change
7647 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	It is planned that Rendlesham Primary School will expand to be a 315 place school. This will create some spare capacity; potentially sufficient places to manage 100 additional dwellings. Based on current forecasts, 150 dwellings would push the school beyond the recommended maximum of 95% capacity	Comments noted. The proposed allocation for Rendlesham is for approximately 100 units across two sites.	No change
7702 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	This large site lies within the former extent of Rendlesham Hall. Within the broader landscape, there is evidence of significant multiperiod archaeological remains, particularly of Anglo-Saxon date. The site should be subject to assessment at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate	Comments noted	<p>Amend paragraph 2.55 to read: "...Neighbourhood Plan. Suffolk County Council - Archaeology have also confirmed that the site should be subject to an appropriate archaeological assessment at an appropriate stage in the design of the development to allow for in-situ preservation where appropriate. This is because the site lies within the former extent of Rendlesham Hall and within the broader landscape, there is evidence of significant multiperiod archaeological remains."</p> <p>Add new bullet to policy SSP10: An archaeological assessment will be required.</p>

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
7414 - Sarah-Jane Quick [3962] 7416 - Philomena Quick [3964]	Object	<p>Range of objections including not balancing new housing provision with the provision of leisure, retail, community and education facilities.</p> <p>The plan should be looking to address the issue of clearing potential contaminants on other sites round Rendlesham</p> <p>Their own developer has not yet made good on its existing commitments for pavement and road top dressing, and street lighting.</p> <p>The Council should consider an alternative housing distribution strategy</p>	<p>The Council's approach to the scale and distribution of development across the district is set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Rendlesham is a larger sustainable settlement, identified as a Key Service Centre which contains a relatively wide range of facilities including employment provision. The policies in the neighbourhood plan provide support for improvements and support for the village centre to continue to provide an appropriate range of uses.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan, the site allocations document and the Core Strategy have all been developed in consultation with service and utility providers. This confirms that the scale of housing proposed can be accommodated. With regard to impact on the local highway network, it is this which is the main constraining factor to housing and employment levels above that set out in the Site Allocations Document.</p>	No change
7117 - Hopkins Homes [551]	Object	<p>The site has not come forward for development to date, despite being allocated in the previous Local Plan. Given its proximity to the Water Re-cycling Centre (sewage treatment works) the delivery of this site for 50 units within the Plan period is therefore doubtful.</p> <p><i>Policy SSP10 should therefore be deleted from the Plan.</i></p>	<p>The Council agrees with the objector that where a site has not come forward for development it is right to question its continued suitability for the use proposed. With regard to this site, the Council is aware of recent interest in the site and that it remains appropriate and suitable for allocation for housing/open space as proposed through the plan.</p>	No change
6818 - RSPB (Jacqui Miller) [2839]	Support	Supports provision of open space as alternative area for dog walkers than more sensitive areas of Rendlesham and Tunstall forest	Support noted	No change
7401 - Fletcher Barton Ltd (Mr William Barton) [3482]	Support	On behalf of landowner supports for inclusion of SSP10	Support noted	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6891 - Ms Nina Robinson [3814]	Support	<p>The cordon sanitaire around the operating sewage works should be defined to the maximum possible. The access to the site is via two roads; Tidy Road and Garden Square, both relatively narrow residential roads with curves only appropriate for the low volume of traffic.</p> <p>Has the capacity of the local water tower for much increased population been assessed.</p>	Comments noted. The plan is informed through comments and advice received from the relevant service providers	No change
2.56				
6648 - Mrs Rosalind Thomas [3747] 6712 - Mrs Valerie Edwards [3774] 6829 - Ms Christine Draude [3823]	Object	<p>Various comments relating to impact of development on Rendlesham and fact that Suffolk Drive is a private road</p> <p><i>Improve local services/facilities Improve public transport links Good to have space for allotments and planting and green areas Keep the farmland</i></p>	Comments noted. This site is to be deleted from the plan primarily due to difficulty with securing suitable access.	Delete paragraph 2.56 from plan
Preferred Option SSP11 Land rear of 3 -33 Suffolk Drive, Rendlesham	Comment	<p>Indicator Number 10 of the Sustainability appraisal (to maintain and where possible improve air quality) needs to be recorded as minor negative '-' and not neutral 'o' as there will be additional emissions from vehicles associated with this site.</p>	Agree. The SA scoring ribbons will be removed in the Publication draft of the DPD but the amendment will be made to the scoring in the Final SA Report.	Amend SA score for policy SSP11, indicator 10 to read: '-' (minor negative)

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7703 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Site lies within the former extent of Rendlesham Hall. Survey identified a concentration of finds. Within the broader landscape, evidence of significant archaeological remains. This is a large area of high archaeological sensitivity. The site should be subject to assessment at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to ensure preservation in situ of significant remains and/or appropriate investigation strategies. Geophysical survey would be advisable at as early a stage as possible and archaeological considerations should be addressed in any design brief for the site. The impacts of development on Rendlesham park should also be considered.	Comment noted. This site is to be deleted from the plan primarily due to difficulty with securing suitable access	No change
6622 - Mr PA & Mrs L Barker [3735] 6640 - David & Karen Smith [3738] 6697 - Mrs Carolyn Walker [3760] 6702 - Mr Edward Walker [3761] 6899 - Mr & Mrs C.A Gibson [3845] 7365 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952] 7415 - Sarah-Jane Quick [3962] 7417 - Philomena Quick [3964] 7466 - Kaylee/Nick Woodard/Goldsmith [3995] 7475 - Mrs R Beadle [4001] 7493 - Tom Griffith-Jones [4016] 7603 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581] 7613 - Sarah-Jane Quick [3962] 7648 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Object	Various comments relating to potential impact of development or objecting to development on this site including the fact that Suffolk Drive is a private road.	Comments noted. This site has been deleted from the plan due primarily to difficulties in securing a satisfactory access to the site.	Delete policy SSP11 and supporting text in paragraphs 2.56 to 2.58 from plan

**Alternative Option**

7402 - Fletcher Barton Ltd (Mr William Barton) [3482]	Support	Support inclusion of SHLAA site 350b within the physical limits boundary	Support noted	No change
---	---------	--	---------------	-----------

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<i>Preferred Option SSP12 - Land north-east of Street Farm</i>				
6830 - Mr. Patrick Wilson [3824]	Comment	<p>Recently undertaken housing and retail developments on Church Hill have had serious impact on traffic flows and congestion in the town centre, particularly at the cross roads junction of the B1121 and B1119. This outcome was readily foreseeable and highlights the shortcoming of the planning process not having required the provision of a second vehicular access connection to the B1121, either to the north or south of the town centre, as condition of its consent. It should therefore be a firm requirement that such alternative connection be included in conditions attached to any consent for further development of this area.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The highway authority require a transport assessment to be provided, thereby confirming that some capacity is still available within the local highway network. The requirement for a transport assessment is included within the policy. The transport assessment would be expected to pick up the more detailed matters referred to.</p>	No change
6580 - Mr Robert Jardine [3163]	Comment	<p>The document refers to further developments north of Church Hill. No mention is made of access other than through the spine roads of existing and future developments leading into Church Hill/Street. Church Street is NOW overloaded. It cannot take any more traffic. I suggest a southern bypass be built to connect Church Hill, adjacent the speed limit sign, passing east of Hurts Hall and joining the A12 at the existing junction ant Benhall. Even without this new housing, this bypass will become essential should Sizewell 'C' materialise</p>	<p>Comments noted. The highway authority have advised that a transport assessment will be required and thereby that capacity still exists within the local highway network to accommodate the scale of growth proposed.</p>	No change
7639 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>SCC education comment that Saxmundham primary school is forecast to be over capacity throughout the five yr period (to 2020). Given history of pupils from Saxmundham attending primary schools at Benhall and Kelsale and vice versa the schools and development within their catchments is considered collectively.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.65 to read as follows "The County Council have indicated that there are capacity issues with regard to primary school places over the five year period to 2020. Encouragement will therefore be given to phasing the development of this site later in the plan period.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7218 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	EA advise that given its size (2.18ha), a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required to consider surface water disposal (see also comments below). The site overlies a Principal Aquifer and is within an Environment Agency Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3. This does not affect the site allocation but may cause comment from us if, for example, deep bore soakaways were proposed to manage surface water.	Comments noted.	Amend paragraph 2.65 to read "....a transport assessment will be required. The Environment Agency have confirmed that due to the size of the site a flood risk assessment will be required to consider surface water disposal. They also note that the site is within an Environment Agency Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 which may be an issue if deep bore soakaways were to be proposed to manage surface water.
7366 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	'Need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available'	Comment noted	Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.65: Anglian Water have confirmed that it is expected that there will be a need for improvements to the foul sewerage network to enable the development of this site.
7704 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	This site is in an area of high archaeological potential overlooking the valley of the River Fromus. Evaluation to the south, identified possible occupation layers of Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age date. Given the size of the development area and the topographic potential of the site, it should be subject to archaeological assessment at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.	Comments noted	Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.65 to read: Suffolk County Council- Archaeology have confirmed that the site is in an area of high archaeological potential overlooking the River Fromus. Evaluation to the south identified possible occupation layers of Later Neolithic / Early Bronze Age date. An archaeological assessment will therefore be required to be undertaken at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for in-situ preservation if appropriate.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7643 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581] 7644 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SCC education confirm strategy is in place to provide places for children expected from homes with extant planning permission in the catchment of the three primary schools - Saxmundham, Benhall and Kelsale. Some limited capacity remains which can, in theory be used to accept proposed new growth. SCC cannot guarantee that all pupils from proposed growth will be able to find a place at local schools. The next Local Plan could look to allocated sufficient new housing to make a new primary school sustainable.	Comments noted. The provision of a new school in the longer term would be a matter for consideration as part of the Local Plan Review	No change
7110 - Hopkins Homes [551]	Support	<p>The Plan's Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates that the site is in a very sustainable location close to Saxmundham town centre, with good access to the key services. The site is deliverable, in accordance with the NPPF in that is available now, offers a suitable location for development and is achievable with a realistic prospect that a viable housing development will be delivered within five years which would contribute towards achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>Changes to Plan:</p> <p><i>2.18ha of land north-east of Street Farm, Saxmundham is identified for residential development for approximately 50 units.</i></p>	Support noted. With regard to numbers, the reference to a lower number of units in the policy reflects the fact that highway capacity is considered to be a potentially limiting factor. The policy confirms that a transport assessment will be required. It would be for a planning application to demonstrate that a higher level of housing could acceptably be provided on site.	No change
2.69	Object	<p>6950 - mr jon dalton [3860]</p> <p>Thorpeness is inappropriate for new housing stock given its lack of employment and no transport. Infilling of buffer areas of green space will destroy the uniqueness of the village. Old Homes Rd is flood prone and a buffer between the housing stock behind the Alms House and the beach. 11 houses will create far too much density on this sensitive location</p>	<p>Comments noted. Thorpeness is identified as a local service centre in the Core Strategy and as such a sustainable settlement capable of accommodating some limited growth. The scale of growth suggested is for approximately 5 units only not 11 and the requirement for a high quality design led scheme reflects the sensitivity of this site in relation to its surroundings. References to surface water flooding were identified through the SHLAA and to the presence of a pond on the site which explain in part why the suggested numbers for a site of this size are relatively low. This information should have been referenced in the supporting text and the policy</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 2.69 to read "Land fronting.... Potential issues with surface water flooding have been identified on part of the site. The site also contains a pond. Whilst these are not issues which would prevent the site being developed, they are matters which any planning application to develop the site will need to address.</p> <p>Amend policy SSP13 through the provision of an additional bullet point "Provision of a surface water management scheme including the retention of the existing pond</p>
<i>Make this site a village green and pond</i>				

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<i>Preferred Option SSP13 - Land fronting Old Homes Road, Thorpeness</i>				
7219 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	Environment Agency note no concerns but we would highlight that the site overlies Principal Aquifer.	Comment noted	No change
7624 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	SCC education note that the local school is over-capacity by 2017 but the estimated addition of one pupil from this site will not make a significant difference	Comment noted	No change
7705 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	This site is in the historic settlement core. No objection in principle but it would require a planning condition under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation. Development should be sensitive to the particular historic character of the built environment	Comments noted.	Amend paragraph 2.69 to read "Land fronting Old Homes Road is 0.4ha in size and located within the historic core of the settlement..."
7367 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	'Need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available'	Anglian Water comment it is expected that there will be a need for improvements to the foul sewerage network to enable the development of this site.	Add additional bullet point to SSP13 An archaeological investigation will be required.
7330 - Mr G Ogilvie [3382]	Object	Whilst this site is within the current development boundary for Thorpeness, many of the "constraints" against site reference 3006 are applicable to the Preferred Option site. In the Preferred Options these do not appear to have been considered; and as such questions the Council's approach to assessing reasonable alternatives	Comment noted. The difference with this site is that it is outside of the physical limits boundary. Access would also need to be via Beacon Hill Lane which is an unadopted road making it harder to deliver. In addition, Thorpeness has already made a significant contribution to housing development since the start of the plan period relative to its size. It is for this reason that limited additional development only is proposed at this time.	No change
7328 - Mr G Ogilvie [3382]	Object	Whilst this site is within the development boundary for Thorpeness, many of the "constraints" against site 3008 are applicable to the Preferred Option site. However, in the Preferred Options document, these do not appear to have been considered and as such questions the Council's approach to assessing reasonable alternatives	Comment noted. The difference between the sites is that site 3008 lies outside of the physical limits boundary. The settlement has already provided a significant quantum of development since the start of the plan period relative to its size hence further limited additional provision only is recommended at this stage.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7326 - Mr G Ogilvie [3382]	Object	Whilst this site is within the current development boundary for Thorpeness, many of the "constraints" against site reference 3005 are applicable to the Preferred Option site. In the Preferred Options these do not appear to have been considered; and as such questions the Council's approach to assessing reasonable alternatives.	Constraints listed against site 3005 are intended to inform the decision making process, and are not, necessarily grounds to discount a particular site. This site has been re-assessed and Site 3005 is now allocated for 40 dwellings following confirmation from Anglian Water that infrastructure issues linked to Leiston Water Recycling Centre no longer apply.	Allocate site 3005 for 40 dwellings under new policy SSP4
7331 - Mr G Ogilvie [3382]	Object	Whilst this site is within the current development boundary for Thorpeness, many of the "constraints" against site reference 3009 Knodishall are applicable to the Preferred Option site. In the Preferred Options these do not appear to have been considered; and as such questions the Council's approach to assessing reasonable alternatives.	Comment noted. Site 3009 differs from this site as it is outside the physical limits boundary and is accessed via an un-made, un-adopted road making delivery more difficult.	No change

#### *Preferred Option SSP14 - Land south of Lower Road Westerfield*

7707 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Suffolk County Council note This site is close to the medieval core of the settlement, and within the findspot of Roman, Saxon and Iron Age objects. There is high potential for the development to impact on archaeological remains of these periods. The site should be subject to archaeological assessment at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate	Comments noted	Add new paragraph after 2.73 to read: Suffolk County Council - archaeology note that this site is close to the medieval core of the settlement and within the findspot of Roman, Saxon and Iron Age objects. The site should therefore be subject to an archaeological assessment at an appropriate stage in the design process which would allow for preservation in-situ where appropriate.
7319 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [2605]	Comment	number of sites proposed for allocation appear to incorporate areas of semi-natural habitat, for example sites at Westerfield and Witenham (Chapel). Such sites should not be allocated until their biodiversity value has been established. In addition, policies for all site allocations should ensure that all development delivers ecological gain in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (section 110).	Comments noted. Where species information is known either on or in the vicinity of sites this is noted against the individual policy. in addition policies SP14 and DM27 Biodiversity and Geodiversity in the adopted Core Strategy also apply.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7463 - John & Pamela Northfield [3992]	Comment	The suggested plan for allocation of building land is reasonable. Development should be low density but the developments should be low density in keeping with the present village distribution. Design of properties should be diverse. No ribbon type development. Provision must be made for public recreation, ie. village green, since future expansion is likely to bring more families into the area, & hence the need for open spaces for recreation.	Comments noted. The recommended expansion of the site area will allow for this type of approach.	No change
7651 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	The catchment school is Rushmere Hall within the borough of Ipswich. The development of the Ipswich Garden Suburb will deliver three new primary schools one of which may be better suited for accommodating children arising from this growth. This may need to be considered in terms of timing of the Ipswich Garden Suburb.	Comments noted. Any changes to catchment areas is a matter for the County Council Education.	No change
7274 - Ipswich Borough Council (Mr Robert Hobbs) [3088]	Comment	Given the close proximity of these sites to the Ipswich Garden Suburb and its proposed facilities and services, the sustainability and mitigation for the SSP14 and SSP15 sites is improved as a result. Ipswich BC would expect that this is taken into account as part of any assessment of these sites and the necessary contributions towards mitigation within the Ipswich Garden Suburb made. Habitat Regulations Assessment mitigation in the form of a country park is being provided in very close proximity to these sites which is necessary mitigation to address the impacts on the Orwell and Stour European Estuaries.	Comments noted. Paragraph 2.70 will be amended to provide additional reference to the relationship between Ipswich Garden Suburb and Westerfield. Elsewhere A new policy is included in relation to the country park	Amend paragraph 2.70 to read: Westerfield is a Local Service Centre, located close to the outskirts of Ipswich and, with a train station, is one of the more sustainable locations in the district. The village is located close to Ipswich's main growth area, Ipswich Garden Suburb, which will provide for around 2,700 new homes together with associated social, community and physical infrastructure provision. When built, these facilities will be accessible to the people of Westerfield. It will be important to ensure that maximum opportunity is made of opportunities to improve pedestrian and cycle links between the village and the new development. The provision of a country park is an important element of the Ipswich Garden Suburb development, required to mitigate the impact of the new development on nearby sites designated as being of international importance for their nature conservation interest (e.g. Orwell and Deben estuaries). In commenting on proposals for the Ipswich Garden Suburb as they have evolved, Suffolk Coastal District Council has emphasised the importance for Westerfield and its community to retain its separate identity. The location of the country park element which crosses into Suffolk Coastal district will ensure this physical separation (see policy SSP35).

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7368 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	Anglian Water has no objection to the proposed allocation of this site for residential development	Comment noted	No change
7220 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	We note the acknowledgement within this policy of the need for an FRA if the built (housing) development extends over 1ha or more.	Comment noted	No change
7460 - Gwen Growder [3989]	Comment	1 - Keep OAK TREES along Road frontage and within site. TREEE PRESEVATION ORDER was put on  2 - Smaller properties that people can afford.  3 - Lower Road was - is and ever shall be, flooded	Comments noted. A flood risk assessment will be required if the housing element extends over 1ha. Anglian Water have confirmed no objection to the site indicating that any issues with possible flooding can be overcome. Reference to TPO now included Details of house type and tenure are more appropriately dealt with at the planning application stage as priority if to be given the provision of open space/village green type facility. The number of dwellings has been increased to 20 in response to viability evidence.	Amend heading to read: (2.45ha approximately 20 units)  Amend paragraph 2.72 to read: "...It is 2.45ha in size, well related to the main central crossroads within the village and sits between and opposite existing groups of residential properties. The site comprises the whole field, which is well defined by existing planted boundaries. The mature oak trees along the frontage with Lower Road are subject to a Tree Preservation Order. There is also a drainage ditch along the Lower Road frontage. Discussions with the Parish Council..."  Amend policy SSP14 to read: 2.45 ha of land ....for approximately 20 units..." Add two new bullets to policy SSP14 to read: Design of the scheme should provide for a pedestrian footway along the Lower Road frontage within the site to avoid detrimental impact on the oak trees which are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order; and Provision of a comprehensive landscaping scheme for the site which provides for the retention of trees and hedgerows along the site boundaries except where it is required to provide access to the site.
7038 - Westerfield Parish Council (Mr Peter Miller) [3597]	Support	The Parish Council note and accept the content of this Policy. The inclusion of the Lower Road cluster of housing into the suggested Revised Physical Limits for Westerfield in the Consultation document is welcomed	Support noted	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6569 - The Kesgrave Covenant Ltd (Mrs Annie Ruffell) [1343] 6966 - The Kesgrave Covenant Ltd [1342]	Support	We believe that in order to provide both good quality housing and a realistic contribution to public open space, that a further triangle of land extending from the bottom south western corner of the allocated site, to the south eastern corner to the rear of the dwellings on Westerfield Road. This area, as highlighted on the attached plan should be allocated for housing and included in the revised physical limits. This would add a further 0.84ha to the site making a total site area of 2.48ha.  We confirm that the land is available and deliverable.	Comments noted. The extension proposed would incorporate the whole of this field which is well defined by existing field boundary planting. The additional land would offer increased flexibility and potentially improve viability for what is intended to be a mixed use scheme providing a new village green type facility.	Amend site area as indicated  Amend paragraph 2.72 to refer to a site area of 2.45ha  Amend policy SSP14 to read "2.45ha of land south of Lower Road, Westerfield is identified for housing and open space provision for approximately 20 units"
<b>2.76</b>				
7607 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Development brief summary for Westerfield should include comment relating to archaeological heritage assets.	Comment noted	Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.76 to read: Suffolk County Council- archaeology note that this site is in an area of archaeological potential. The development brief should reference the need for an archaeological investigation with the design of new development allowing for in-situ preservation if appropriate.  Add new bullet point to policy SSP15 to read: An archaeological investigation will be required.

#### *Preferred Option SSP15 - Land at Old Station Works, Main Road Westerfield*

7652 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	The catchment school is Rushmere Hall within the borough of Ipswich. The development of the Ipswich Garden Suburb will deliver three new primary schools one of which may be better suited for accommodating children arising from this growth. This may need to be considered in terms of timing of the Ipswich Garden Suburb	Comment noted. This is an issue which is probably best addressed at the planning application stage.	No change
---	---------	--	---	-----------

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7579 - Network Rail (Katie Brown) [3961]	Comment	<p>The developer/applicant must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* encroach onto Network Rail land</li> <li>* affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company's railway and its infrastructure</li> <li>* undermine its support zone</li> <li>* damage the company's infrastructure</li> <li>* place additional load on cuttings</li> <li>* adversely affect any railway land or structure</li> <li>* over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land</li> <li>* cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future</li> </ul>	Comment noted. These are matters which are more appropriately addressed at the planning application stage. The site is the subject of a current planning application.	No change
7661 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	The sites in Westerfield will need to be considered alongside the Ipswich Garden Suburb allocation. In respect of SSP15 (Land at Old Station Works) opportunities for pedestrian and cycle access south of the railway should be considered.	Comment noted	Changes already suggested to policy SSP15 and paragraph 2.70 in response to other similar reps.
7611 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Whilst most other sites are sufficiently small and/or isolated from other development such that they do not justify significant additional consideration, the site proposed in Westerfield will need to be considered alongside the Ipswich Garden Suburb allocation. In respect of site SSP15 (Land at Old Station Works), opportunities for pedestrian and cycle access south of the railway should be considered.	Comment noted.	In response to other comments an additional reference has been included to the Ipswich Garden Suburb in policy SSP15. Amendments have been made to paragraph 2.70
7130 - Historic England (Sir/Madam) [744]	Comment	Whilst we consider that the site can take some form of frontage development we still have concerns regarding the infilling of the whole of the site and the impact this would have on the setting of the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary Magdalene and Grade II Listed former Rectory. It is also considered that the drainage ditch to the eastern part of the site maybe of archaeological interest and this should be investigated. Given the concerns over the development of the eastern part of the site it is considered that it should be left open and fairly undeveloped.	Comments noted. These are issues which can be addressed through the development brief. Reference to historic interest is included within the policy	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7706 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>Site is in an area of archaeological potential.</p> <p>The site should be subject to assessment at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate.</p>	Comment noted	<p>Add new paragraph after paragraph 2.76 to read: Suffolk County Council- archaeology note that this site is in an area of archaeological potential. The development brief should reference the need for an archaeological investigation with the design of new development allowing for in-situ preservation if appropriate.</p>
7275 - Ipswich Borough Council (Mr Robert Hobbs) [3088]	Comment	<p>Given the close proximity of these sites to the Ipswich Garden Suburb and its proposed facilities and services, the sustainability and mitigation for the SSP14 and SSP15 sites is improved as a result. Ipswich BC would expect that this is taken into account as part of any assessment of these sites and the necessary contributions towards mitigation within the Ipswich Garden Suburb made. Habitat Regulations Assessment mitigation in the form of a country park is being provided in very close proximity to these sites which is necessary mitigation to address the impacts on the Orwell and Stour European Estuaries.</p>	Comments noted. Same general points made against policy SSP14 by Ipswich Borough Council.	<p>See amendments listed under policy SSP14.</p> <p>Amend first bullet point of SSP15 to read:"..comprehensive manner including its relationship to the Ipswich Garden Suburb proposals"</p>
7369 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	<p>Anglian Water confirm it is expected that there will be a need for improvements to the foul sewerage network to enable the development of this site.</p>	Comment noted.	<p>Amend paragraph 2.75 to read:Anglian Water have confirmed that it expected that there will be a need for improvements to the foul sewerage network</p> <p>Add new bullet point to policy SSP15: * The developer will need to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available;</p> <p><i>the following text should be include in Policy SSP15:</i></p> <p><i>'Need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available'</i></p>

<b><i>Representations</i></b>	<b><i>Nature</i></b>	<b><i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i></b>	<b><i>Council's Assessment</i></b>	<b><i>Action</i></b>
7320 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [2605]	Comment	A number of sites proposed for allocation appear to incorporate areas of semi-natural habitat, for example sites at Westerfield and Wintesham (Chapel). Such sites should not be allocated until their biodiversity value has been established. In addition, policies for all site allocations should ensure that all development delivers ecological gain in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (section 110).	Comments noted. Where species are known to be on or within the vicinity of a site this is noted against the specific policy. Policies SP14 and DM27 in the adopted Core Strategy also refer to biodiversity and geodiversity	No change
7197 - Cubitt Projects Ltd [3916]	Support	The 2014 SHLAA document identified an indicative capacity of 30 residential units at the site. Analysis by consultants indicated the site is capable of providing over 80 units. Listening to the views of local people and refining our proposals our scheme now provides 35 residential units, with associated uses/facilities and a provision of a number of small B1 business units. It is important to ensure the number of residential units is sufficient to allow for an economically viable scheme that will enable the provision of B1 units on the site and to balance this with the views we have received.	Comments noted.	No change

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
7040 - Westerfield Parish Council (Mr Peter Miller) [3597]	Support	<p>The Parish Council note the text of the recommended option and support the use of this site for a mixed-use development. It is agreed that the best way forward would be for a development brief to be established but the Parish Council consider that the uses listed in the second paragraph may be too restrictive. Similarly, the Parish Council often find difficulty in finding rooms for small public meetings and information displays due to lack of rooms as the Parish Council do not have control of any such facility.</p>	Comments noted.	<p>Amend the Policies Map for Westerfield to include a new physical limits boundary around the Westerfield Station area to incorporate the existing developed area and the old station works site.</p>
<p><i>The Parish Council consider there are merits in drawing a third physical limits boundary around the cluster at the Railway level crossing. The boundary at this locality could embrace the currently developed area together with recently approved planning applications and also the area of Old Station Works which is the subject of SSP15.</i></p>				
6746 - WL & MD Pipe (Mr William Pipe) [3784]	Object	<p>Objects to non-allocation of land adjacent to Glebe House. It would link the Old Station Works site with the rest of the village and help sustain community facilities. It is well located to the main road and to Westerfield railway station. The presence of the historic drain could be incorporated as a feature into any design for the site as could the presence of the listed building.</p>	<p>There are a significant number of sites in Westerfield which are potentially suitable for housing, which if developed would provide for a scale of development out of keeping with the settlement. The sites identified as preferred options provide the opportunity for additional community benefits.</p>	No change
<p><i>Include land adjacent to Glebe House (site622)</i></p>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Preferred Option SSP16 - Land at Street Farm, Witnesham (Bridge)</i>				
7276 - Ipswich Borough Council (Mr Robert Hobbs) [3088]	Comment	We note the proposal for new residential development on identified sites in both Westerfield and Witnesham as detailed in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies development plan document. As these sites are in close proximity to Ipswich Borough, we feel development here should address any additional impact on existing services and infrastructure. There are current pressures on transport, sports facilities and green spaces within the town. It is noted that the Sustainability Appraisal identifies the services of nearby Ipswich, as well as Westerfield railway station as a positive in terms of the sustainability of the location of certain sites.	Comments noted. The issues raised are generic and given the distance of Witnesham from Ipswich and the Ipswich Garden Suburb, it is considered that these are most appropriately dealt with at the planning application stage.	No change
7709 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	This site is on the south bank of the River Fynn. No objection in principle but it will require a planning condition under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation.	Comment noted	Amend paragraph 2.78 to read: "... Special Landscape Area. Suffolk County Council-Archaeology note that due to its location on the south bank of the River Fynn an archaeological investigation will be required. A small section...
7649 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Based on current forecasts, proposed housing takes school to the maximum it can manage. Total level of growth may need to be considered against school rolls at time site comes forward. Future pupil forecasts may reveal that pupils arising from site cannot be accepted, and/or CIL contributions may be needed to enable expansion.	Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with the County Council on matters relating to schools provision. At this stage, the issues raised are considered to be more appropriately dealt with at the planning application stage.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7221 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	<p>The text supporting this policy (paragraph 2.78), highlights that residential development within Flood Zone 3 should be avoided. We would suggest that this should be amended to any development within Flood Zone 3 should be avoided. This is to ensure that no other impediments to flows are introduced that could increase flood risk downstream. This requirement is a key issue for this site, and should also be included as part of the policy.</p> <p>We would also suggest that any opportunities to improve and enhance the riverside environment at this location should be considered under the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p><i>Amend wording of paragraph 2.78 to read "any development within Flood Zone 3 should be avoided".</i></p>	Comment noted	<p>Amend paragraph 2.78 to read: ".... Any development within Flood Zone 3..."</p> <p>Add two new bullet points to policy SSP16 to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Any development within the area identified as Flood Zone 3 should be avoided to ensure no other impediments to flows are introduced that could increase the risk of flooding downstream</li> <li>* Opportunities should be explored which would improve and enhance the riverside environment in this location under the Water Framework Directive</li> </ul>
7662 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	The sites in Westerfield will need to be considered alongside the Ipswich Garden Suburb allocation. In respect of SSP15 (Land at Old Station Works) opportunities for pedestrian and cycle access south of the railway should be considered.	This comment is wrongly logged against policy SSP16. An identical comment has been responded to under policy SSP15	No change
7370 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	Anglian Water confirm they have no objection to the allocation of this site	Comment noted	Amend paragraph 2.78 to read: "...planning application. Anglian Water confirm they have no objection to the allocation of this site. Existing access to the site ..."
7125 - Swilland and Witnesham Parish Council (Sarah-Jayne Bailey) [3058]	Support	Parish Council supports the allocation of this site	Support noted	No change

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action	
2.80	6825 - P&A/A&S Clarke/Gardiner [3817]	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. neighbours knew nothing about this proposal until the site notice was posted.</li> <li>2. A strip of land along the road frontage belongs to Fir Tree Cottage</li> <li>3. There is an outstanding registration of a right of way where neighbours have had open unchallenged access to their gardens since at least the early 1990's.</li> <li>4. The field floods each winter. any development scheme would require a drainage solution.</li> <li>5. A main sewer crosses the site</li> <li>6. Access - a previous planning application was refused on highway grounds as insufficient land to provide sight lines.</li> <li>7. The road is busy. At weekends it suffers from onroad parking - overflow from the community car park.</li> </ul>	<p>It is clear from the comments received that there are a number of issues which make development of this site difficult and which call into question its deliverability in the short term. It is considered that a successful scheme along the lines suggested by the Parish Council could potentially be achieved but is likely to require a landswap in order to achieve the necessary sight lines. A larger site area would provide the flexibility to take account of the sewers and rights of access. It is recommended that the site is deleted from this plan but is given further consideration as part of the Local Plan Review.</p>	Delete policy SSP17 and supporting text from the plan.
<i>SSP17 - Land south of the primary school, Witnesham</i>	7321 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [2605]	Comment	<p>A number of sites proposed for allocation appear to incorporate areas of semi-natural habitat, for example sites at Westerfield and Witnesham (Chapel). Such sites should not be allocated until their biodiversity value has been established. In addition, policies for all site allocations should ensure that all development delivers ecological gain in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (section 110).</p>	<p>Comment noted. In response to other comments received this policy and the supporting text are to be deleted from the plan</p>	No change
7277 - Ipswich Borough Council (Mr Robert Hobbs) [3088]	Comment	<p>We note the proposal for new residential development on identified sites in both Westerfield and Witnesham as detailed in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies development plan document. As these sites are in close proximity to Ipswich Borough, we feel development here should address any additional impact on existing services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comments noted. In response to other comments received this policy and the supporting text is to be deleted from the plan</p>	No change.	
7708 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>The site and its area have not been subject to archaeological investigation. No objection in principle but it will require a planning condition under the NPPF to secure a programme of archaeological investigation</p>	Comment noted	No change. This policy and associated text is to be deleted	

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7650 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Based on current forecasts, proposed housing takes school to the maximum it can manage. Total level of growth may need to be considered against school rolls at time site comes forward. Future pupil forecasts may reveal that pupils arising from site cannot be accepted, and/or CIL contributions may be needed to enable expansion	Comment noted. In response to other comments received this policy and the supporting text are to be deleted from the plan	No change
7371 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	Anglian Water have no objection to the development of this site	Comment noted	No change
6687 - Linda Pace [3740] 6783 - Mr Peter Wiggin [3796] 6826 - P&A/A&S Clarke/Gardiner [3817] 7126 - Swilland and Witnesham Parish Council (Sarah-Jayne Bailey) [3058]	Object	Issues - strip of land along site frontage belongs to Fir Tree Cottage Outstanding registration of right of way across part of site to neighbours gardens Previous planning application failed (was withdrawn) due to problems in achieving required sight lines Main sewer crosses part of site The field floods every winter - drainage is an issue. Existing traffic issues will be exacerbated. A layby for school drop-off was proposed many years ago. This would be useful on busy bus route. Parish Council support development on this site but recommend that it be extended to include the whole field to make best use of land. Their suggestion is for a well designed cul-de-sac.	It is clear from the comments received that there are a number of issues which make development of this site difficult and which call into question its deliverability in the short term. It is considered that a successful scheme along the lines suggested by the Parish Council could potentially be achieved but is likely to require a landswoop in order to achieve the necessary sight lines. A larger site area would provide the flexibility to take account of the sewers and rights of access. It is recommended that the site is deleted from this plan but is given further consideration as part of the Local Plan Review.	Delete policy SSP17 and supporting text from the plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b>Economy</b>				
<b>3.01</b>				
7237 - EDF Energy Networks Ltd [Diego Sanchez-Lopez] [3364]	Comment	Given that the District Council considers the possible development of additional nuclear power stations at Sizewell to be sufficiently important to justify the inclusion of a distinct Strategic Policy in the adopted Core Strategy, it would be reasonable to expect the Site Allocations Document to reflect and safeguard this policy within its allocations.	The Council's policy for Sizewell is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy SP13- Nuclear Power. Given the strategic, national importance of Sizewell, and that any decision on future developments there will be taken by the Secretary of State, it is not considered necessary or appropriate for an additional policy on Sizewell to be included in the Site Allocation document.	No change.
<b>3.02</b>				
6878 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Support	I support the creation of additional employment floor space at Adastral Park as long as the required infrastructure is put in place at the appropriate time so that additional traffic problems will not cause additional pollution or noise problems for residents already living in the area.	Support noted.	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

3.04

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6698 - Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]	Comment	<p>Wording should clearly explain the status of the land in question. Part of the area defined in the Strategic Employment Site is designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Remove reference to currently as this suggests that there is potential for it to be de-designated. (Further comment on latter point in other sections).</p> <p>Description should state it is of national importance for its natural beauty.</p>	<p>Agree. The changes suggested by the Suffolk Coast and Heaths to this and other representations on this policy can be made and paras 3.04 to 3.11 have been rewritten. The map showing the 3 sites within the AONB in both SCDC and IBC areas (page 59) can now be deleted. The AONB and IBC/SCDC boundary will be added to the map showing the strategic allocation on page 58. The revised text also includes changes to reflect representations made by the Environment Agency, Anglian Water, Suffolk County Council, Historic England and Natural England.</p>	<p>Amend paras 3.04 to 3.11 to read:</p> <p>3.04 This 30 ha site lies to the east of the existing Ransomes Business Park. The whole site is self contained being bounded by the A14, the railway line and the adjacent employment corridor of Ransomes Business Park/Ransomes Europark. The site is suitable for a range of uses including B1 Business, B2 general industry and B8 storage and distribution. The primary issues are access and impact on the local road network, the desire to maintain a balance of uses across this wider employment area, and potential adverse impacts on the AONB such as visual impact on the landscape and the natural beauty of the wider AONB.</p> <p>3.05 The site comprises 19 ha of land which has been carried forward as an employment allocation from the previous Local Plan, just over 14 ha of which is vacant and available for development. This part of the site represents the final phased area of development of the Ransomes Business Park/Ransomes Europark employment area, the majority of which lies within the neighbouring Ipswich Borough Council administrative area. Both Councils consider this employment area to be of strategic importance with Local Plan policies to support this view. For Suffolk Coastal, the relevant policy is Core Strategy policy SP5 -Employment Land.</p> <p>3.06 The eastern most part of this strategic allocation extends the previously allocated area by approximately 11 ha and will assist in providing employment land in a well established employment area with easy access to Ipswich and the wider area via the A14. This part of the site lies wholly within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, of national importance for its natural beauty. The boundary of the AONB follows the track running north south along the eastern boundary of the Piggeries and the lorry park. This part of the AONB has a degree of physical and visual separation from areas of AONB lying to the south, having been severed from the larger AONB</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
				designation by the construction of the A14 trunk road in 1980.
				3.07 Consultation received a mixed response to extending the employment area into the AONB. Where objection was raised, this appears to be an objection in principle to the loss of AONB rather than specific objection to the parcel of land in question and could potentially be overcome if mitigation measures are provided.
				3.08 Discussions have taken place between Ipswich Borough Council, which have a similar site specific issue in the AONB, Suffolk Coastal Council and the AONB Partnership to see if common agreement could be reached that would allow development to take place on the sites in question. As a result, a statement has been agreed with the Suffolk Coastal and Heaths Partnership that recognises the importance of sustainable development and the economic well-being of the area and provides support in principle for the site being allocated for economic development. The Partnership is clear that any detrimental impact upon the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB landscape should be appropriately mitigated, through site master planning or a planning brief in consultation with the Partnership. The Council concurs that if development is allowed to take place, it should be subject to a development brief to ensure that the development is high quality and a range of matters are addressed including impact on the landscape and the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB in the immediate and wider area.
				3.09 Historic England has also confirmed that extending into the AONB could have an impact on a number of scheduled monuments immediately to the east ; namely several pre-historic bowl barrows (burial sites) as part of the Seven Hills barrow cemetery. These would require investigation and also need to be taken into account in the development brief.
				3.10 The Environment Agency have highlighted

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>that the site overlies Principal and Secondary Aquifers and whilst this does not affect the allocation of the site it may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses will also need to be investigated prior to the submission of a planning application. As a site of over 1 ha, a flood risk assessment will also be required.</p> <p>3.11 Anglian Water require any developer to demonstrate that foul sewerage can be adequately dealt with.</p> <p>3.12 To reflect discussions and the agreed position between the Council, Ipswich Borough Council and the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Partnership, a development brief will be prepared by the District Council to provide detailed planning guidance for the whole area, covering both the former employment allocation and the AONB element.</p> <p>Amend Policy SSP8 to read: Policy SSP18 Ransomes, Nacton Heath (around 30 hectares)</p> <p>30ha of land is identified at Ransomes, Nacton Heath as shown on the Policies Map for new employment provision for a mix of B1, B2 and B8 uses. Development will be subject to the preparation of development brief by the District Council.</p> <p>The development brief will be expected to address a range of matters including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Impact on landscape including the nationally designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;</li> <li>*Further investigation into any designated and non designated heritage assets required;</li> <li>*Impact on the local and strategic highway network including provision for access to public transport, and access via foot and cycle;</li> <li>*A more precise mix of B1, B2 and B8 uses across the site;</li> <li>*Guidance as to the appropriate design, scale and massing of buildings for example through the</li> </ul>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
				introduction of a design code; *The need for a flood risk assessment; *The need for developers to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available; *The need to investigate the potential contamination of the site prior to the submission of a planning application; and *The need to work with existing businesses within the site.
				Delete the map on page 59
				Amend the map on page 58 to include the AONB and the IBC/SCDC boundary
6988 - The Land Group [3293]	Support	The Land Group can confirm that the land is suitable and available for development and share the Council's ambition to deliver a high quality employment site, which respects its location and provides much needed strategic employment land within easy access to Ipswich and the A14.	Support noted	No change
6699 - Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]	Comment	Remove reference to 'currently', the area is either outside or within the designated AONB.	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.
6859 - Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]	Comment	Consideration should not be limited to visual impact on the AONB, but refer to adverse impacts in a wider sense.	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>3.07</b>				
6700 - Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]	Comment	<p>Disagree that the wording 'the land has changed character over the years' should be used. This paragraph should simply refer to whether the area is within or outside the designated AONB without making a judgement on quality or condition of landscape in question. Re-word to explain that the three parcels of land within the AONB on the northern side of the A14 trunk road have a degree of actual and visual separation from areas of AONB lying to the south.</p> <p>Map title 'Areas to be considered for deletion' should be amended to: 'Map showing areas within AONB proposed for development'.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>
6879 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Object	<p>Ransomes Europark should not be extended into the AONB</p> <p><i>Do not extend into AONB</i></p>	<p>Comment noted but see response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>3.08</b>	Object	<p>6701 - Suffolk Coast &amp; Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]</p> <p>Areas to be considered for deletion is not considered appropriate. The wording does not take account of the AONB designation and complexity of the processes that would be required for amendments to the designation. Suggest this description is replaced with 'areas proposed to be developed within the AONB'. The Partnership will offer advice and contribute to masterplan/development briefs with suggestions for appropriate mitigation measures. All policy relating to AONBs would still stand and would have to be taken into account when determining any applications for these particular sites.</p> <p>Reference to Historic England is a different point and requires a separate sub-heading.</p> <p><i>Re-word paragraph taking into account agreed statement from AONB Partnership as detailed in attached file. Re-write in context of development within designated area - ensuring development proposals brought forward will take account of AONB designation. Suggested edits:</i></p> <p><i>Discussions are currently underway....AONB Partnership to see if a common agreement can be reached that would allow adequate mitigation for development in the nationally designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Delete reference to exception to normal AONB restrictive policy. Initial discussions with the AONB Joint Advisory Committee indicate that an agreed statement is likely to be forthcoming. ....development adequately mitigates and adverse impact upon the nationally designated AONB and is high quality....</i></p> <p><i>Create new sub-heading in relation to Historic England.</i></p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>
<b>3.09</b>	Comment	<p>6855 - Suffolk Coast &amp; Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]</p> <p>Disagree with reference to the sites being different to the 'main' AONB. The land is either within the designation boundary or not.</p> <p>Disagree with the wording of the last sentence, the AONB covering the land in question will still be in place.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>3.11</b>				
7608 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Development brief for Nacton/Ransomes Europark should include comment relating to archaeological heritage assets	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.
6856 - Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]	Comment	Refer to Partnership statement attached. The suggestion of planning guidance is welcome. The Partnership would expect to comment on any individual applications that may come forward. As per earlier representations, any suggestion of designating the AONB is not considered viable. It is suggested that reference to this in the last sentence should be removed.	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.
<b>Preferred Policy SSP18 Ransomes, Nacton Heath</b>				
7342 - Natural England (Sir/ Madam) [2516]	Comment	The potential development within the AONB has significant landscape and visual impacts. We note that potential mitigation is stated to include designation of AONB land, rationalising existing AONB boundary and/or high quality design of buildings, structures and setting to reduce landscape impacts and impacts on potential historic interests. We advise that the policy should not rely on the AONB boundary being amended. However, we support the proposal for a development brief to be prepared to provide detailed planning guidance covering both the former employment allocation and the AONB element to allow for a more flexible approach to be progressed.	Comments and support noted.	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.
7604 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Nacton SSP18 - this large site is close to the Seven Hills barrows, and cropmarks of multiperiod sites.	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.	See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7222 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	<p>The site overlies Principal and Secondary A Aquifers. This does not necessarily affect the allocation of this site but may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses will need to be investigated ahead of the submission of any planning application.</p> <p>As with the housing sites, all proposals for development of greater than 1ha should be accompanied by an FRA.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>
7131 - Historic England (Sir/Madam) [744]	Comment	<p>I can advise that we agree with the flexible policy approach proposed and welcome the highlighted need for a development brief. It is considered that a development brief should consider both designated and non-designated heritage. It is therefore considered that the policy should be slightly amended to include further investigation into any non-designated heritage assets also.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>
7278 - Ipswich Borough Council (Mr Robert Hobbs) [3088]	Comment	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>	<p>Comment noted and the commitment to continued collaborative working welcomed.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>
7372 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	<p>It is expected that there will be a need for improvements to the foul sewerage network to enable the development of this site.</p> <p><i>It is therefore suggested that the following text should be include in Policy SSP13:</i></p> <p><i>'Need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available'</i></p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>
6857 - Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]	Comment	<p>Impact on landscape should be re-worded to:</p> <p>Impact on landscape including the nationally designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>	<p>See response to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB representation 6698 relating to revisions to Policy SSP18 and the associated text and maps.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7064 - Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council (Mrs Marian Rose) [2722]	Object	<p>Strategic Employment Site - refers to the future development of Ransomes, Nacton Heath. This would require the reversion of AONB land to developable land. Whilst we can see the sense of this, as small areas of AONB are separated from the main area by an A road, it does extend the build environment of Ipswich eastwards, although it is bounded, at present, by the A12/A14 road.</p> <p>We therefore see any developments eastwards from Ipswich, beyond the A12/A14 road, as a risk to the valued green space between Ipswich and Felixstowe.</p>	Comments noted	No change
<b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>				
6858 - Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]	Comment	<p>The loss of agricultural land and encroachment on the AONB has identified major significant environmental effects.</p> <p>Delete all reference to de-designation on AONB. This has been outlined in earlier representations as a non-viable proposition. Instead, refer to: Proposed development should mitigate any adverse impacts on the AONB appropriately.</p>	Agree.	<p>Delete references to de-designation of the AONB in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Add new wording into SA pro-forma for SSP18 to read:</p> <p>Proposed development should mitigate any adverse impacts on the AONB appropriately.</p>
6805 - Ipswich Buses (Mr Jeremy Cooper) [3807]	Comment	Overcoming the dependence of out of town employment sites on private cars needs positive action and a proper understanding of how buses can be assisted to solve the issues.	Noted. Policy SSP18 requires the preparation of a development brief for the site, an aspect of which will be to address the impact of development on the strategic highway network and access to public transport.	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Preferred Option SSP19 - Land at Silverlace Green(former airfield) Parham</b>				
7223 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	<p>The site overlies a Principal Aquifer. The western end of the site falls with an Environment Agency Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 1, the eastern end SPZ3 and the central section SPZ2. This is associated with the public supply borehole located at TM31686019. As above, this does not necessarily affect the site allocation but may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses, particularly those associated with former airfields, will need to be investigated ahead of the submission of any planning application.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Agree to add additional wording to supporting text and policy to highlight existing Aquifers, SPZ and potential contamination.</p>	<p>Add new paragraph after paragraph 3.15 to read: The Environment Agency have highlighted that the site overlies a Principal Aquifer, the western end of the site falls within an Environment agency Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 1, the eastern end SPZ3 and central section SPZ 2. Whilst this does not affect the allocation of the site it may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses will also need to be investigated prior to the submission of a planning application.</p>
7373 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	<p>It is noted that it proposed to allocate land at the former airfield for employment uses.</p> <p>This site is located some distance from the existing foul sewerage network and therefore it may not be viable to connect to the existing foul network and a new sewage treatment facility may be required.</p> <p>Therefore it is recommended that these issues are investigated further and Policy SSP19 is amended accordingly.</p> <p><i>This site is located some distance from the existing foul sewerage network and therefore it may not be viable to connect to the existing foul network and a new sewage treatment facility may be required.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore it is recommended that these issues are investigated further and Policy SSP19 is amended accordingly.</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. Agree to add additional wording to supporting text and policy SSP19 to flag up potential requirement for new sewage treatment facility.</p>	<p>Add new paragraph below 3.15 to read: Anglian Water have advised that development of these sites may require a new sewage treatment facility, this should be discussed between the developer and Anglian Water ahead of any planning application being submitted to the Council.</p> <p>Add new bullet to policy SSP19 to read: *Adequate sewerage treatment facilities are provided.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7629 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>It should be noted that as some allocations come forward their will need to be more detailed assessment of the compatibility between development and permitted waste uses. For example further employment at Parham may need to consider whether mitigation is needed to manage the relationship with existing uses.</p> <p>The County Council as Minerals and Waste Authority has no objection to the proposed allocations in respect of the minerals and waste plans on grounds of conflict with permitted and allocated mineral and waste sites.</p>	<p>Support for allocation noted. Agree to add new wording to highlight the need to take account of existing waste uses at the site.</p>	<p>Add new wording after 3.15 to read:</p> <p>At site SSP19 consideration should be given to the need for mitigation to manage the relationship between any new employment uses and the existing waste uses on the site</p> <p>Add new bullet point to policy SSP19 to read:</p> <p>*the proposals address the need to manage the relationship between the new use and the existing waste facility on the site.</p>
7605 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Need to assess and manage World War II heritage Assets.	Agree. Add extra wording to supporting text and policy to reflect potential for heritage assets at the site.	<p>Add new paragraph under para 3.16 to read:</p> <p>Any development proposal should include a desk-based assessment and historic asset assessment any of buildings to be affected, particularly if buildings survive relating to military use. Proposals should include appropriate treatment of heritage assets. Archaeological investigation will be required at an appropriate stage in the development process, depending on the scale and nature of proposals.</p> <p>Add new bullet to policy SSP19 to read:</p> <p>* Where appropriate, measures have been taken to assess and manage any heritage assets on the site.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Preferred Option SSP20 former airfield Parham</b>				
7606 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Need to assess and manage World War II heritage Assets.	Agree. Add extra wording to supporting text and policy to reflect potential for heritage assets at the site.	<p>Add new paragraph under para 3.16 to read:</p> <p>Any development proposal should include a desk-based assessment and historic asset assessment of building to be affected, particularly if buildings survive relating to military use. Proposals should include appropriate treatment of heritage assets. Archaeological investigation will be required at an appropriate stage in the development process, depending on the scale and nature of proposals.</p>
7374 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	<p>It is noted that it proposed to allocate land at the former airfield for employment uses.</p> <p>This site is located some distance from the existing foul sewerage network and therefore it may not be viable to connect to the existing foul network and a new sewage treatment facility may be required.</p> <p>Therefore it is recommended that these issues are investigated further and Policy SSP20 is amended accordingly.</p> <p><i>This site is located some distance from the existing foul sewerage network and therefore it may not be viable to connect to the existing foul network and a new sewage treatment facility may be required.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore it is recommended that these issues are investigated further and Policy SSP20 is amended accordingly.</i></p>	Comment noted. Agree to add new wording to supporting text and policy to flag up potential requirement for new sewage treatment facility.	<p>Add new paragraph below 3.15 to read:</p> <p>Anglian Water have advised that development of these sites may require a new sewage treatment facility, this should be discussed between the developer and Anglian Water ahead of any planning application being submitted to the Council.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Preferred Option SSP21 former airfield Debach</b>				
7693 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>Any development proposals should include a desk-based assessment and historic asset assessment of any structures to be affected. Archaeological investigation may be required at an appropriate stage in the development process, depending on the scale and nature of proposals.</p>	<p>Agree. Add extra wording to supporting text and policy to reflect potential for heritage assets at the site.</p>	<p>Add new paragraph under para 3.18 to read:</p> <p>Any development proposal should include a desk-based assessment and historic asset assessment of building to be affected. Proposals should include appropriate treatment of heritage assets. Archaeological investigation will be required at an appropriate stage in the development process, depending on the scale and nature of proposals.</p>

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
6979 - Debach Ent/Clopton Com Pk [3870]	Comment	<p>The joint owners of the Debach site the subject of draft policy SSP21 support the preferred option for the site subject to minor amendments. The site has no environmental constraints limiting its operation and is well related to the highway network.</p> <p>The control provided by the draft policy alongside the flexibility of the general employment area status and small increase in the policy boundary means the Council's 'preferred option' will allow the site to continue to contribute to the economy of the district and beyond for the plan period.</p>	Agree.	<p>Amend 2nd bullet of policy SSP21 to read:</p> <p>*Where necessary, a transport statement or transport assessment can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority that the scale and type of traffic generated is acceptable in terms of impact on the local road network.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7375 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	<p>It is noted that it proposed to allocate land at the former airfield for employment uses.</p> <p>This site is located some distance from the existing foul sewerage network and therefore it may not be viable to connect to the existing foul network and a new sewage treatment facility may be required. Therefore it is recommended that these issues are investigated further and Policy SSP21 is amended accordingly.</p> <p><i>This site is located some distance from the existing foul sewerage network and therefore it may not be viable to connect to the existing foul network and a new sewage treatment facility may be required. Therefore it is recommended that these issues are investigated further and Policy SSP21 is amended accordingly.</i></p>	Comment noted. Agree to add additional wording to supporting text and policy to flag up potential need for new sewage treatment facility.	<p>Add new paragraph below 3.18 to read:</p> <p>Anglian Water have advised that development of this site may require a new sewage treatment facility, this should be discussed between the developer and Anglian Water ahead of any planning application being submitted to the Council.</p> <p>Add new bullet to policy SSP21 to read:</p> <p>*Adequate sewage treatment facilities are provided.</p>
7224 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	<p>The site overlies a Principal Aquifer, with a groundwater abstraction licence in place approximately 50m from the site boundary at TM23755413. This does not necessarily affect the site allocation but may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses will need to be investigated ahead of the submission of any planning application.</p>	Comment noted. Agree to add additional wording to supporting text and policy to highlight existing Aquifer and potential contamination.	<p>Add new paragraph after paragraph 3.18 to read:</p> <p>The Environment Agency have highlighted that the site overlies a Principal Aquifer, with a groundwater abstraction licence in place approximately 50m from the site boundary. Whilst this does not affect the allocation of the site it may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses will also need to be investigated prior to the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>Add new bullet point to Policy SSP21 to read:</p> <p>* Investigation of potential contamination at the site has been undertaken prior to submission of any planning application</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6827 - Clopton Parish Council (Mr Christopher Angwin) [3227]	Object	<p>We request that SSP21 be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The use is restricted to activities falling within Use Classes B1 and B2 only, unless related to agriculture</li> <li>-Warehousing, storage (including large scale agricultural storage development), or haulage uses likely to result in a material increase in traffic will not be permitted.</li> <li>-The refurbishment or replacement of existing buildings must not result in any increase in the total floor area of the existing buildings on the site.</li> <li>-A transport assessment could demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Highways authority that the scale and type of traffic generated would remain substantially unchanged.</li> </ul>	Comments noted. However, the policy as currently worded is considered to provide an adequate framework for the determination of future planning applications on the site. The amendments suggested would result in an unworkable policy that would be difficult to implement. Existing permissions on the site are not tied into agricultural use.	No change.
<b>Preferred Option SSP22 Bentwaters Park, Rendlesham</b>				
7659 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Cumulative Consideration Southern Sites Melton Crossroads. Proposed development taken together with existing traffic and background growth in vehicular traffic means cumulative impact is likely to be significant. It is unlikely that transport issues would render the sites undeliverable (under the ill-defined "severe" test set out in NPPF) However an increase in queuing at junction would have to be expected. This may require further consideration in respect of air quality issues.	Comments noted. Development on the site will come forward in accordance with the recently granted planning permission (c/10/3239) which considers traffic impacts. The Council will continue to work with SCC on this issue.	No change.
7376 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	It is expected that there will be a need for improvements to the foul sewerage network to enable the development of this site.	Agree. Development on the site will come forward in accordance with the recently granted planning permission (c/10/3239). Add extra wording to the supporting text to reflect Anglian Water comments.	Add new paragraph under para 3.23 to read: Anglian Water have advised that improvements to the sewerage treatment capacity may be required. The extent of any improvements will need to be assessed through discussion between the developer and Anglian Water.
<p><i>It is therefore suggested that the following text should be include in Policy SSP22:</i></p> <p><i>'Need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available'</i></p>				
7609 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Considerations for historic assets are flagged, and development would be managed under C/10/3239.	Comment noted.	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7657 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	Cumulative Consideration Southern Sites. Key junction is the A1152/B1438 Woods Lane crossroads, Melton which carries the majority of through traffic from developments east of A12 from Orford to Bawdsey. Majority of proposed sites are small scale and impacts likely to be modest. Significant sites at Rendlesham, residential and employment, will need to fully consider impact on this junction and any collision sites and other significant sites along A1152 route. Impacts along A12 from Seven Hills to B1438 will need to be assessed once location of employment growth at Adastral identified within Adastral Park site is confirmed.	Comments noted. Development on the site will come forward in accordance with the recently granted planning permission (c/10/3239) which considers traffic impacts. The Council will continue to work with SCC on this issue.	No change.
7654 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	The County Council as Minerals and Waste Authority has no objection to the proposed allocations in respect of the minerals and waste plans on grounds of conflict with permitted and allocated mineral and waste sites.	Support noted.	No change.
7628 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	It should be noted that as some allocations come forward there will need to be more detailed assessment of the compatibility between development and permitted waste uses. For example further employment at Parham may need to consider whether mitigation is needed to manage the relationship with existing uses.	Comments noted. Development on the site will come forward in accordance with the recently granted planning permission (c/10/3239). Agree to add new wording to supporting text to highlight the existing waste use on the site.	Amend Para 3.22 to read: The site is also host to a number of innovative renewable energy facilities (including an anaerobic digester), and is connected to the Suffolk Strategic Lorry Route Network via a Zone Distributor Route.
7225 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	The site overlies Principal and Secondary Aquifers. This does not necessarily affect the site allocation but may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses, particularly those associated with former airfields, will need to be investigated ahead of the submission of any planning application.	Comment noted. Agree to add additional wording to supporting text to highlight existing Aquifers and potential contamination.	Add new paragraph after paragraph 3.23 to read: The Environment Agency have highlighted that the site overlies Principal and Secondary Aquifers. Whilst this does not affect the allocation of the site it may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses may also need to be investigated.
6625 - Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC Environmental Protection) [2963]	Comment	Indicator Number 10 of the Sustainability appraisal (to maintain and where possible improve air quality) needs to be recorded as minor negative '-' and not neutral 'o' as there will be additional emissions from vehicles associated with this site.	Agree. The SA scoring ribbons will be removed in the Publication draft of the DPD but the amendment will be made to the scoring in the Final SA Report.	Amend SA score for policy SSP22, indicator 10 to read: '-' (minor negative)

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6819 - RSPB (Jacqui Miller) [2839]	Comment	We note that the policy refers to the sensitivities of this site within the AONB. This policy should also recognise that Bentwaters Parks adjoins the Sandlings SPA and is in close proximity to the Alde-Ore Estuary SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. It will be necessary to consider potential effects on these designated wildlife sites when making decisions as to future activities on this site.	Agree. Add extra wording to supporting text and policy to highlight other environmental designations in the vicinity of the site.	Amend 4th sentence of para 3.19 to read: The site lies wholly within AONB, adjoins The Sandlings SPA and is in close proximity to the Alde-Ore Estuary SPA, SAC and Ramsar site.  Amend final sentence of policy SSP22 to read: In both circumstances, proposals should confirm to local and national planning policy, particularly with regard to the environmental designations on and in close proximity to the site.
6978 - Debach Ent/Clopton Com Pk [3870]	Support	The joint owners of Bentwaters support the draft policy SSP22 because it takes a flexible approach to future development where it can be demonstrated that any resultant impacts can be shown to be acceptable. It is hoped that following the approval of the 'masterplan' planning application this new planning policy, while offering the owners and tenants the flexibility they need, can give comfort to the local community that both the economic asset of the site and the surrounding environment will be given due regard in the future.	Support noted.	No change.

*Preferred Option SSP23 Carlton Park, Main Road, Kelsale cum Carlton*

7377 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	Anglian Water has no objection to the proposed allocation of this site for employment development.	Support noted.	No change.
---	---------	--	----------------	------------

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7694 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>Any development proposals should include a desk-based assessment and historic asset assessment of any structures to be affected. Archaeological investigation may be required at an appropriate stage in the development process, depending on the scale and nature of proposals.</p> <p><i>Any development proposals should include a desk-based assessment and historic asset assessment of any structures to be affected. Archaeological investigation may be required at an appropriate stage in the development process, depending on the scale and nature of proposals.</i></p>	<p>Agree. Add extra wording to supporting text and policy to reflect potential for heritage assets at the site.</p>	<p>Add new paragraph under para 3.27 to read:</p> <p>Any development proposal should include a desk-based assessment and historic asset assessment of building to be affected. Proposals should include appropriate treatment of heritage assets.</p> <p>Archaeological investigation will be required at an appropriate stage in the development process, depending on the scale and nature of proposals.</p> <p>Add new bullet to policy SSP19 to read:</p> <p>* Where appropriate, measures should be taken to assess and manage any heritage assets on the site.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7226 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	<p>The site overlies a Principal Aquifer and is within an Environment Agency Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3. This does not necessarily affect the site allocation but may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses will need to be investigated ahead of the submission of any planning application.</p> <p>The site also includes a small area of Flood Zone 3 along the southern boundary, and a wider extent of Flood Zone 2 which encroaches into the undeveloped area. Any proposals for development must have regard to this issue and be accompanied by an FRA.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Agree to add additional wording to supporting text and policy to highlight existing Aquifers, potential contamination and flood risk.</p>	<p>Add two new paragraphs after paragraph 3.27 to read:</p> <p>The Environment Agency have highlighted that the site overlies a Principal Aquifer and is within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3. Whilst this does not affect the allocation of the site it may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses will also need to be investigated prior to the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>The site includes a small area of Flood Zone 3 along the southern boundary, and a wider extent of Flood Zone 2 which encroaches into the undeveloped area. Any proposals for development must therefore have regard to this issue and be accompanied a Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Add new wording to policy SSP23 read:</p> <p>Proposals for further development of the site should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>An investigation into any potential contamination of the site should be undertaken prior to the submission of a planning application.</p>

#### *Preferred Option SSP24 Levington Park, Levington*

7227 - The Environment Agency Comment The site overlies Principal Aquifer. (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]

Agree. Add new paragraph in supporting text to highlight the existence of a Principal Aquifer on the site.

Add new paragraph after 3.28 to read:

The Environment Agency have highlighted that the site overlies a Principal Aquifer. Whilst this does not affect the allocation of the site it may impact on future uses or activities.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7378 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	It is expected that there will be a need for improvements to the foul sewerage network to enable the development of this site.	Agree.	<p>add new paragraph after 3.28 to read: Anglian Water have advised that development of this site may require improvements to the sewerage treatment capacity. The extent of any improvements will need to be assessed through discussion between the developer and Anglian Water ahead of any planning application being submitted to the District Council.</p>
		<p><i>It is therefore suggested that the following text should be include in Policy SSP24:</i></p> <p><i>'Need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available'</i></p>		<p>Add new sentence to Policy SSP24 to read: Any proposals for development at the site will need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available.</p>
7228 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	The site overlies a Principal Aquifer and is within an Environment Agency Groundwater Source Protection Zone 2. This does not necessarily affect the site allocation but may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses, particularly those associated with former airfields, will need to be investigated ahead of the submission of any planning application.	Comment noted. Agree to add additional wording to supporting text and policy to highlight existing Aquifer, SPZ 2 and potential contamination.	<p>Add new paragraph after paragraph 3.31 to read: The Environment Agency have highlighted that the site overlies a Principal Aquifer and is within an Environment agency Groundwater Source Protection Zone 2. Whilst this does not affect the allocation of the site it may impact on future uses or activities. Contamination from previous uses will also need to be investigated prior to the submission of a planning application.</p>
				<p>Add new bullet point to Policy SSP25 to read:</p> <p>* Developers will need to investigate the potential contamination of the site prior to the submission of a planning application;</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7379 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	It is expected that there will be a need for improvements to the foul sewerage network to enable the development of this site.	Agree. Add new wording to supporting text and policy to highlight sewerage treatment capacity issues at the site.	<p>Add new paragraph below paragraph 3.31 to read: Anglian Water have advised that development of this site may require improvements to the sewerage treatment capacity. The extent of any improvements will need to be assessed through discussion between the developer and Anglian Water ahead of any planning application being submitted to the District Council.</p> <p>Add new bullet to policy SSP25 to read:  *Developers will need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available.</p> <p><i>It is therefore suggested that the following text should be include in Policy SSP25:</i></p> <p><i>'Need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available'</i></p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>	
<b>Retail</b>	<i>Preferred Policy SSP26 Aldeburgh Town Centre</i>	7132 - Historic England (Sir/Madam) [744]	Comment It is considered the policy should cover conservation and design issues. Also the policy should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features both in terms of the positive contribution historic shopfronts make to the character of an area but also the economic benefit of providing traditional and bespoke shopping units to shopowners. As well as including conservation and design issues within these policies the Council could consider additional advice within a Supplementary Planning Guide on Historic Shopfronts, especially given the importance and contribution the Historic shopping areas within the settlements of Suffolk make to the wider area.	<p>Agree that additional references to retaining or restoring historic shopfronts could be added to the policy.</p> <p>There is already a strategic policy framework in place setting out the principles of good design and the value of the historic environment. The Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan (Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD) includes Policy SP15- Landscape and Townscape which provides the 'high level', strategic policy relating to the Historic Environment. Core Strategy policy DM21 covers design aesthetics, setting out the criteria that the Council expects schemes to adhere to in order for planning permission to be granted. In addition to the two Local Plan policies the Council also has Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating Shopfronts, Signs and Advertisements which includes specific guidance on historic shopfronts.</p> <p>Any changes to the strategic policy framework would be best taken forward as part of the Local Plan review. This will better reflect the cross cutting nature of the historic environment issues and provide the opportunity to develop policies that can be applied over the whole district (including areas taking forward neighbourhood plans).</p>	<p>Add an additional sentence to policy SSP26, third paragraph to read:</p> <p>Particular consideration should be given to retaining and/or restoring historic shopfronts.</p> <p>Add new paragraph after 4.06 to read:</p> <p>The High Street retains a number of traditional shopfronts that remain in the original 'as built' condition. These contribute positively to the attractiveness and distinct identity of the Town Centre.</p>
7030 - Aldeburgh Society (Mr Tony Bone) [3834]	Support	The Society supports the Town Centre Policy outlined.	Support noted.	No change.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>	
<i>Preferred Option SSP27 Saxmundham Town Centre</i>				
7133 - Historic England (Sir/Madam) [744]	Comment	<p>It is considered the policy should cover conservation and design issues. Also the policy should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features both in terms of the positive contribution historic shopfronts make to the character of an area but also the economic benefit of providing traditional and bespoke shopping units to shopowners. As well as including conservation and design issues within these policies the Council could consider additional advice within a Supplementary Planning Guide on Historic Shopfronts, especially given the importance and contribution the Historic shopping areas within the settlements of Suffolk make to the wider area.</p>	<p>Agree that additional references to retaining or restoring historic shopfronts could be added to the policy.</p>	<p>Add an additional sentence to policy SSP27, third paragraph, after first sentence to read: Particular consideration should be given to retaining and/or restoring historic shopfronts.</p>
<i>4.33 Wickham Market</i>				
6672 - Wickham Market Parish Council (Mr Richard Jenkinson) [3106]	Support	<p>The amended District centre boundary on page 88 is in accordance with our wishes. The larger area encompasses the George Public House and the new Coop.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Preferred Options SSP28 District Centres</b>				
7134 - Historic England (Sir/ Madam) [744]	Comment	It is considered the policy should cover conservation and design issues. Also the policy should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features both in terms of the positive contribution historic shopfronts make to the character of an area but also the economic benefit of providing traditional and bespoke shopping units to shopowners. As well as including conservation and design issues within these policies the Council could consider additional advice within a Supplementary Planning Guide on Historic Shopfronts, especially given the importance and contribution the Historic shopping areas within the settlements of Suffolk make to the wider area.	Agree that additional references to retaining or restoring historic shopfronts could be added to the policy.	Add an additional sentence to policy SSP28, second paragraph to read: Particular consideration should be given to opportunities to retain and/or restore historic shopfronts.
<b>4.39 Bixley Farm, Rushmere St Andrew</b>				
6996 - Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council (Mr Mel Bentley) [502]	Support	Page 89, Paragraph 4.39 Bixley Farm - We note that Bixley Farm was originally identified as a District Centre under saved policy AP59, but as the development only contains limited facilities it has now been re-classified as a 'local centre'. We fully support this reclassification.	Support noted.	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Preferred Option SSP29 Local Centres</b>				
7135 - Historic England (Sir/ Madam) [744]	Comment	It is considered the policy should cover conservation and design issues. Also the policy should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features both in terms of the positive contribution historic shopfronts make to the character of an area but also the economic benefit of providing traditional and bespoke shopping units to shopowners. As well as including conservation and design issues within these policies the Council could consider additional advice within a Supplementary Planning Guide on Historic Shopfronts, especially given the importance and contribution the Historic shopping areas within the settlements of Suffolk make to the wider area.	Neither of the local centres identified in policy SSP29 (Saxmundham Rd, Aldeburgh and Bixley Farm, Rushmere) contain any historic shopfronts therefore it is not considered necessary to amend the policy.	No change.
7031 - Aldeburgh Society (Mr Tony Bone) [3834]	Support	Local Centre, Saxmundham Road: The Society supports this designation, but wonders if it should include the hairdressers, dry cleaners (on the frontage of the laundry site), Hall Farm Shops, the local Pub (the Railway Hotel), and the Community Centre, and create a policy for enhancement, in addition to the suggested policy, which appears just to ensure that there is no diminution in provision.	Support noted. Agree to add the dry cleaners, hairdressers, Railway hotel public house and community centre into the Local Centre designation. However, it is not considered appropriate to include the retail units at the Hall Farm Shop due to distance from the main cluster of the local centre.	<p>Amend map for Aldeburgh Local Centre to include the following additional commercial units- hairdressers, dry cleaners, and the Railway Hotel public house.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.37 to read 'Where possible, the Council will look to retain retail provision where this will help to meet the day to day needs of local residents.'</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Tourism / Leisure</b>				
<b>5.01</b>	Comment	7128 - Historic England (Sir/Madam) [744] We welcome the section on Tourism and particularly support the acknowledgement of the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the tourist offer within Suffolk Coastal's administrative boundary, as shown at points 5.01 - 5.03 on page 93. We would just advise the word 'historic' is inserted between 'high quality' and 'environment' on line 6 of page 93 to differentiate between historic and natural interests.	Agree.	Amended paragraph 5.01, 4th sentence to read: Many are linked to the high quality historic environment and nature conservation interest such as Minsmere Nature Reserve, Dunwich Coast and Heaths; and Rendlesham and Tunstall Forests.
<b>5.04</b>				
6880 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Support	I support these comments	Support noted.	No change.
<b>Preferred Option SSP30 Visitor Management - Deben Estuary</b>				
7049 - Deben Estuary Partnership (Christine Block) [2600]	Comment	* Reference to mitigation - proposals - arising from evidence collected in a specially commissioned Visitor Survey and cross referenced with environmental designations - are set out in the Deben Estuary Plan * Reference to access to the river - slipways or jetties. Inclusion of this point is helpful - but there are important issues, over and above increased recreational activity, which would result in a 'significant (and potentially negative) effect' - ie- new jetties, pontoons or slipways which cause : erosion or damage to riverbanks or saltmarsh/scouring or silting of the river bed/obstruction of footpaths/obstruction of existing recreational 'beach' areas.	Agreed. As currently worded this policy could be interpreted to mean that the requirements of the final para would only apply to those proposals that would result in increased recreational activity. Requirements should apply to all proposed improvements to existing access points direct into the estuary.	In response to this and other comments this policy and supporting text have been re-worded in consultation with Natural England, and expanded to apply to all European sites.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6820 - RSPB (Jacqui Miller) [2839]	Comment	Policy SSP30 proposes a restriction on public car parking within 1km of the Deben Estuary as mitigation against increases in recreational pressure resulting from the in-combination effects of housing proposals in the area. Whilst we support some restrictions on new parking provision, we suggest this should focus on provision relating to activities likely to cause most disturbance and/or locations that are most sensitive to disturbance. Seasonal restrictions could also be considered, based on the presence of sensitive species. We are also concerned that purely restricting access does not encourage responsible behaviour and enjoyment of and respect for the natural environment.	Policy and supporting text has been re-drafted in consultation with Natural England and now applies to all European sites	See new paragraphs 5.03 - 5.06 and re-worded policy SSP32 - Visitor Management - European Sites
6881 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Support	I support the introduction of this policy.	Support noted.	No change but see revisions to policy and supporting text which now applies to all European sites.
7280 - Ipswich Borough Council (Mr Robert Hobbs) [3088]	Support	This policy, which restricts car parking at locations along the Deben Estuary, is supported as it contributes towards mitigation of potential effects on the Deben Estuary Special Protection Area arising from housing growth in Ipswich as well as Suffolk Coastal.	Support noted.	No change but see revisions to policy and supporting text which now applies to all European sites
6835 - Waldringfield Parish Council (Mr David Lines) [2859]	Support	We agree with the policy described in these sections and SSP30.	Support noted.	No change but see revisions to policy and supporting text which now applies to all European sites
7343 - Natural England (Sir/Madam) [2516]	Support	We agree with the policy to prevent increased recreational disturbance of Deben Estuary by preventing any additional car parking provision within a 1km distance of the estuary and by requiring proposed improvements to existing access points which would result in an increased level of recreational activity on the estuary to demonstrate that they will not result in any "significant effect" either on their own or in combination with other uses.	Support noted.	No change but see revisions to policy and supporting text which now applies to all European sites.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<i>Preferred Option SSP31 Snape Maltings (replaces policy AP166)</i>				
7229 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	We note that the further use of this site is supported, following the preparation of a comprehensive development scheme which is to include "flood defence measures". While we welcome this reference, given that the site mostly falls within Flood Zone 3, we would suggest that the wording could be amended to ensure that the impacts and implications of flood risk are considered across the site. We would suggest as an alternative: "flood risk management across the site, including appropriate flood defence measures".	Agree.	Amend 6th bullet point of policy SSP31 to read: - flood risk management across the site, including appropriate flood defence measures;
7380 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [3952]	Comment	It is expected that there will be a need for improvements to the foul sewerage network to enable the development of this site for arts, recreation and tourism related development.	Agree.	Add new bullet to policy to SSP31 to read: - the need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available.
7344 - Natural England (Sir/ Madam) [2516]	Comment	'Need to demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or that capacity can be made available'	Agreed.	Add new paragraph to policy SSP31 to read: Applications for development of this site will need to be subject to a HRA screening. Any development which would result in significant adverse effects which could not be appropriately mitigated will not be permitted. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will also be required at application stage.
6821 - RSPB (Jacqui Miller) [2839]	Comment	While para. 5.06 refers to the conservation importance of the area within which Snape Maltings is set, the policy itself does not. We recommend that the sentence requiring that all proposals should seek to protect and enhance the special character and interest of the heritage assets should be amended to include the natural environment as well.	Agree.	Amend 1st sentence, 2nd paragraph of Policy SSP31 to read: All proposals should seek to protect and enhance the special character and interest of the heritage assets and natural environment at the site and the wider Snape Maltings Conservation Area.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6626 - Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC Environmental Protection) [2963]	Comment	Indicator Number 10 of the Sustainability appraisal (to maintain and where possible improve air quality) needs to be recorded as minor negative '-' and not neutral '0' as there will be additional emissions from vehicles associated with this site.	Agree. The SA scoring ribbons will be removed in the Publication draft of the DPD but the amendment will be made to the scoring in the Final SA Report.	Amend SA score for policy SSP31, indicator 10 to read: '-' (minor negative)
<b>Preferred Options SSP32 Suffolk Showground - Trinity Park</b>				
7230 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	Although not within our remit we assume Suffolk Wildlife Trust have made reference to the avoidance/ mitigation of impacts from potential housing development on the immediately adjacent rare lowland heath habitat at the Purdis Heath SSSI.	Agree.  No comments received from SWT on this matter.	Add new wording to policy SSP32, 1st para, final sentence, to read:  and that measures to prevent damage to the adjacent Site of Special Scientific Interest.
7710 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	This site has archaeological potential, on the former Foxhall Heath. Prehistoric finds are recorded in the vicinity. The site should be subject to archaeological assessment at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.	Agree. Add extra wording to supporting text and policy to reflect potential for heritage assets at the site.	Add new paragraph under para 5.09 to read:  The site should be subject to archaeological assessment at an appropriate stage in the design of new development to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.
7279 - Ipswich Borough Council (Mr Robert Hobbs) [3088]	Support	Ipswich Borough Council supports the long term future of the Suffolk Showground as an events venue being retained, and notes that planning permission will only be granted for housing within the site where its provision is legally bound to the long term future of the Showground as an events venue being retained.	Support noted.	Add new sentence to policy SSP32 to read: * Proposals should demonstrate that appropriate measures have been taken to assess and manage any heritage assets on the site.  No change.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<b>Recreation and Green Infrastructure</b>				
<b>6.01</b>				
7407 - M.S. Oakes Ltd [3958]	Comment	<p>Brickfields can contribute towards the objectives contained in the preferred option SSP34 - regarding special landscape status by inclusion of additional suitable landscaping to along the southern boundary of the development site</p> <p>- At para 6.07 (see App 11) it is expected that most the provision of green space will be provided in conjunction with new housing development. The Brickfields development over achieves in this respect offering a generous amount of open space. In addition the use of CIL could be targeted towards enhancing open space elsewhere in the town if required</p>	<p>This is not a site that is being promoted through the site allocations document. This site is subject to a current planning application and these issues will be looked as part of the Development Management process.</p>	No change.
7281 - Ipswich Borough Council (Mr Robert Hobbs) [3088]	Comment	<p>It is recommended that Suffolk Coastal District Council include provision to ensure that contributions can be sought towards mitigation measures identified through the Habitats Regulations Assessment within Chapter 6 'Recreation and Green Infrastructure' of their Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies development plan document (or elsewhere if considered appropriate), with the inclusion of a new policy if necessary. This should acknowledge that measures not classified as infrastructure may need to be funded outside of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) process, and this can be investigated as part of the production of a mitigation strategy.</p>	<p>Amendments to the Site Allocations document in response to other reps have included the addition of a new policy covering the Ipswich Country Park. Other matters are being explored through the joint Recreation Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy being produced across Ipswich Borough, SCDC, and Babergh councils. The Recreation Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy to be completed by March 2017.</p>	No change, see new policy on Ipswich Country Park.
7189 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club [3914]	Support	<p>Additional policy required (section 6 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club course expansion proposals linked to delivery of new holes, heath restoration, wider green infrastructure and public open space northern edge of Ipswich).</p> <p>My client supports the current wording of this paragraph and agrees that access to green space is important for people's mental and physical well-being and the encouragement given to enhancing improved access to green spaces within the District.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This site lies within the area covered by the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan &amp; Site Allocations Document. As a scheme, it is considered that this is more appropriately dealt with by means of a planning application rather than the plan making process</p>	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>6.02</b>		<p>7192 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club [3914]</p> <p>Support</p> <p>Additional policy required (section 6 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club course expansion proposals linked to delivery of new holes, heath restoration, wider green infrastructure and public open space northern edge of Ipswich).</p> <p>My client supports the Council's view that access to green infrastructure and recreation provision makes a significant contribution to sustainable development and sustainable communities.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This site lies within the area covered by the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan &amp; Site Allocations Document. As a scheme, it is considered that this is more appropriately dealt with by means of a planning application rather than the plan making process</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>6.03</b>		<p>7711 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [2605]</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>New development brings increased demand for green space, the evidence for green infrastructure planning in the district is currently underpinned by the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy (The Landscape Partnership, 2008) and a Green Infrastructure Strategy (The Landscape Partnership, 2011) for the area within the district outside of the Haven Gateway Area. The site allocations process should be used as a mechanism for the implementation of such strategies. As both of these documents are a number of years old we recommend that as part of the development plan process they are updated and that a single plan is produced to cover the whole district. Such a plan should also take account of green infrastructure in neighbouring districts and boroughs in order to produce a plan at a strategic scale.</p> <p><i>As both of these documents are a number of years old we recommend that as part of the development plan process they are updated and that a single plan is produced to cover the whole district. Such a plan should also take account of green infrastructure in neighbouring districts and boroughs in order to produce a plan at a strategic scale.</i></p>	<p>In 2008 the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy (HAGGIS) was published and has been recently updated, as stated in the document 6.03. The report aims to provide accessible natural greenspace provision, including woodland, to identify provision and deficiencies across the Haven Gateway area and identified opportunities to enhance provision. Furthermore, policies SP14-Biodiversity and Geodiversity, and DM27 Biodiversity and Geodiversity seek to implement the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan and Suffolk Local Geodiversity Action Plan. In addition, it is the Council's intention to update the 2011 Green Infrastructure Strategy for Suffolk Coastal in due course.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

6.06

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7243 - Crest Nicholson [3927]	Comment	As outlined in the SAASP, SCDC is relying on the provision of the Country Park to help address deficiencies in accessible natural greenspace within its own administrative area. As such, a proposed extension to the Country Park (within SCDC) provides an opportunity for SCDC policies to contribute to the provision of the Country Park, and facilitate greater links to alternative natural greenspace, relieving the pressure on the estuaries.	Comments noted. It is important that the Site Allocations Document reflects the comprehensive development scheme for this area. New policy and supporting text in relation to country park element.	<p>Add new policy and supporting text.</p> <p>In Suffolk Coastal district there is a deficit of accessible natural greenspace along the northern edge of Ipswich. The planned provision of a country park at Ipswich Garden Suburb will help address this deficiency. This is relevant for nearby parishes in Suffolk Coastal district such as Westerfield.</p> <p>The Ipswich Garden Suburb is a significant urban extension to Ipswich which will provide up to 2,700 new homes, supported by new social and community and physical infrastructure provision. The provision of a country park is a key requirement of this proposal, necessary to help mitigate identified in-combination effects on nearby Natura 2000 sites, designated as being of international importance for their nature conservation interest. The development will be subject to a detailed masterplan, which is in process of agreement at the time of drafting this document. Suffolk Coastal District Council has been involved in the preparation of the master plan as a consultee. A key requirement has been to ensure that Westerfield retains its identity as a separate village close to Ipswich town. The location of the country park as part of this comprehensive scheme will provide the necessary buffer between Westerfield village and the proposed new urban areas. Part of the proposed area for the country park fall within Suffolk Coastal district. These two parcels of land marked A and B on the following plan (and shown on the Inset Map for Westerfield) are within the control of the developers for the Ipswich Garden suburb and are allocated for use as public open space as part of the larger country park associated with the Ipswich Garden Suburb</p> <p>Policy SSP* Land off Westerfield Road and Lower Road, Westerfield (Ipswich Garden Suburb Country Park)</p> <p>Two parcels of land as shown on the Policies Map are designated as public open space. This land is</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>	
	Support	<p><i>The land identified in Appendix B should be allocated within the SAASP to form part of the adjoining Country Park within Ipswich Borough.</i></p>	<p>Additional policy required (section 6 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club course expansion proposals linked to delivery of new holes, heath restoration, wider green infrastructure and public open space northern edge of Ipswich).</p> <p>My client support the Council's view that there is a significant shortfall in accessible natural green space on the northern edge of Ipswich. My client contends that a specific reference should be inserted in this paragraph acknowledging the potential for the WHGC proposals to go some way to addressing this shortfall within the plan period.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This site lies within the area covered by the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan &amp; Site Allocations Document. As a scheme, it is considered that this is more appropriately dealt with by means of a planning application rather than the plan making process.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
7193 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club [3914]					

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>	
<b>6.08</b>	7194 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club [3914]	Support	<p>Additional policy required section 6 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club course expansion proposals linked to delivery of new holes, heath restoration, wider green infrastructure and public open space northern edge of Ipswich.</p> <p><i>A reference should be inserted supporting innovative forms of new development that meet peoples housing needs whilst also seeking to remedy existing open space deficiencies within the District.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. This site lies within the area covered by the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan &amp; Site Allocations Document. As a scheme, it is considered that this is more appropriately dealt with by means of a planning application rather than the plan making process</p>	No change
<b>6.09</b>	6822 - RSPB (Jacqui Miller) [2839]	Comment	<p>In our previous comments of 26th February 2015 on the Issues and Options consultation, we recommended that the 2011 Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Suffolk Coastal district is also updated. We also recommend that the outputs from the HAGGIS update and an update to the Suffolk Coastal Green Infrastructure Strategy should be consolidated into an SPD setting out a district-wide strategy, alongside standards for green infrastructure provision within developments. The production of an SPD would clarify and formalise requirements and ensure that there is one easily accessible set of targets and standards for the district.</p>	<p>The updated Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy (HAGGIS) for the Ipswich Policy Area August 2015 is available on the Council's planning policy evidence base pages. The policy area includes part of Suffolk Coastal.</p> <p>Any future update will be informed by an HRA Mitigation and Monitoring Strategy being produced across Ipswich Borough, SCDC, and Babergh councils. The Recreational Avoidance &amp; Mitigation Strategy due to be completed by March 2017.</p>	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>	
<b>6.11</b>	7477 - Mr Neil Ward [2762]	Support	<p>THE DELETION OF POLICY AP225 FOXHALL ROAD WOODLANDS IS SUPPORTED. THE DESIGNATION OF LOWER TIER PROTECTIVE LANDSCAPE DESIGNATIONS IS NOT SUPPORTED BY THE NPPF WHICH ADVOCATES A CRITERIA BASED STRATEGIC POLICY AND THE ADOPTED CORE STRATEGY FOLLOWS THE NPPF APPROACH.</p> <p>IN ADDITION, THE WHOLE OF THE AREA NORTH OF FOXHALL ROAD, WITH SOME MINOR EXCEPTIONS, IS PART OF THE SITE APPROVED FOR USE IN CONNECTION WITH FOXHALL STADIUM UNDER PLANNING PERMISSION P/E711 AND CONSEQUENTLY IS A COMMERCIAL SITE WHICH CONSTITUTES PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED (BROWNFIELD) LAND FOR THE PURPOSES OF APPLYING NPPF GUIDANCE AND CORE STRATEGY POLICY.</p>	Support noted.	No change.
<b>6.12</b>	7195 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club [3914]	Object	<p>My client objects to the wording of this paragraph and would request a reference be inserted into this paragraph promoting the sensitive redevelopment and expansion of WHGC facility subject to no adverse impact of the AONB.</p> <p><i>My client objects to the wording of this paragraph and would request a reference be inserted into this paragraph promoting the sensitive redevelopment and expansion of WHGC facility subject to no adverse impact of the AONB.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. This site lies within the area covered by the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan &amp; Site Allocations Document. As a scheme, it is considered that this is more appropriately dealt with by means of a planning application rather than the plan making process.</p>	No change.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<b>Environment</b>				
7.01	Comment	7184 - Taylor Wimpey [2902] There are various policies that refer to a Policies Map but no such Map appears to exist. Policies within the SAASP are difficult to understand without sight of such a map. The Policies Map needs to cover the whole district (including neighbourhood plan areas) to ensure the identification of strategic issues are not omitted.	The Council has not as yet updated the full Policies Map for the district which will in time replace the 2001 Proposals Map. However, inset maps were provided for the policies in the SAASP.	An updated Policies Map will need to be produced by the time the plan is submitted for independent inspection.
<i>Provision of a Policies Map covering the whole district</i>				
7.03	Comment	7050 - Deben Estuary Partnership (Christine Block) [2600] Reference to mitigating the impact of future development in regard to the Deben Estuary - targeted mitigation measures needed are also noted in the Deben Estuary Plan. Disturbance of the hinterland feeding and roosting areas of the species listed in connection with SPA / RAMSAR designations - ie behind the intertidal estuary - may also require mitigation.	Comments noted	Amend paragraph 7.03 to read: Mitigating the impact of future development is a key environmental consideration within this document. It is also an issue which is picked up through the relevant estuary management plans such as the Deben Estuary Management Plan. It is also an issue which will need to be addressed in relation to relevant neighbourhood plans such as those for Melton, Woodbridge and Martlesham. The scale of housing growth..."
<i>A reference to the Deben Estuary Plan could be helpful here</i>				
6823 - RSPB (Jacqui Miller) [2839]	Comment	Para. 7.03 discusses potential mitigation required as a result of increased recreational pressure. It should be clarified that this mitigation is with regard to impacts on designated European conservation sites (SPAs, SACs and Ramsar sites).	Paragraph wrongly referenced in terms of comments made. Reference requested is already included in paragraph 7.17	No change
6866 - Bromeswell Parish Council (Mr Robert Cutts) [2991]	Comment	The environmental safeguards do not go far enough. The duty should be on the developer to provide the evidence that detrimental impacts to designated environmental or nature protection areas will not occur. There should be a presumption against development on land within 1 km of this type of land (eg. SSSI, Ramsar protected sites)to match the limitation on new car parks etc. given in SSP30.	Comments noted. The Council takes advice from Natural England on these matters. NE do not require a presumption against development within 1km of protected sites. What they do expect is an Habitats Regulation Assessment to be undertaken to identify any significant effect and any necessary mitigation measures.	No change but see also revisions policy SSP30 (now SSPP32) Visitor Management which now applies to all European sites

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7246 - Mr David Trouse [167]	Object	Some medium scale development at Adastral Park would be acceptable as part of the district's future housing growth but it should not be anything like as large as is currently envisaged. Any such medium scale development would need more practical and realistic mitigation policies than are currently being proposed if serious detrimental effect on the area (transport, environment etc) is to be avoided.	The identification of Adastral Park as a strategic location for growth was debated and tested through the preparation and independent Examination of the Core Strategy and was subsequently adopted in July 2013. It is not the role of the Site Allocations document to reconsider this growth location.	No change
6882 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Support	I support these comments	Support noted.	No change

#### 7.04

7127 - Historic England (Sir/ Madam) [744]	Comment	It is acknowledged that the Council still do not propose an individual policy on the Historic Environment, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework, we therefore reiterate our previous comment on ensuring a positive strategy is secured within the document as a whole. . There is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and issues such as heritage.	Comments noted. Within the remit of this Site Allocations Document the Council is content that the combined approach to the historic environment is an appropriate one. In addition to the polices in the Core Strategy, additional references have been included against individual sites as recommended elsewhere by Historic England and Suffolk County Council - Archaeology. An alternative approach or strategy would be a matter for the Local Plan Review.	No change
--	---------	---	--	-----------

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7602 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [2581]	Comment	<p>Archaeological remains are not included in the section on non-designated heritage assets, the document only refers to non-designated buildings and landscape features. An informative section which highlights the archaeology of the area and its management in the development process to potential developers would be beneficial. Not only will this help developers and landowners understand the likely evaluation and excavation costs to be placed on their sites, it will also help ensure that appropriate assessment is carried out at an early stage. Furthermore, archaeological heritage is a tourism asset for Suffolk, and the development process can help promote understanding of our heritage.</p>	Comments noted	<p>Add new section after paragraph 7.07 entitled Archaeology to read: Suffolk Coastal has a rich, diverse and dense archaeological landscape with the river valleys, in particular, topographically favourable for early occupation of all periods. The distinctive character of the historic environment in the District includes upstanding coastal archaeology of all dates, prehistoric burial tumuli on the open heathlands around the eastern margins of Ipswich and on the Felixstowe peninsula, the remains of Roman small towns at Felixstowe and Wenhampton, the internationally important Anglo-Saxon burial ground at Sutton Hoo, numerous medieval historic towns and villages with both above and below ground heritage assets, for example Woodbridge and Aldeburgh, and the strategically placed, Napoleonic Martello towers. These are among over 7,300 sites of archaeological interest currently recorded in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record for Suffolk Coastal. It is considered that there is no identified need to provide separate policies in relation to these un-designated heritage assets over and above that contained in the Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework.</p>

*it is suggested that the following is inserted into the section on the historic environment:*

*Suffolk Coastal has a rich, diverse and dense archaeological landscape with the river valleys, in particular, topographically favourable for early occupation of all periods. The distinctive character of the historic environment in the District includes upstanding coastal archaeology of all dates, prehistoric burial tumuli on the open heathlands around the eastern margins of Ipswich and on the Felixstowe peninsula, the remains of Roman small*

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
		<p><i>towns at Felixstowe and Wenham, the internationally important Anglo-Saxon burial ground at Sutton Hoo, numerous medieval historic towns and villages with both above and below ground heritage assets, for example Woodbridge and Aldeburgh, and the strategically placed, Napoleonic Martello towers. These are among over 7,300 sites of archaeological interest currently recorded in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record for Suffolk Coastal. It is considered that there is no identified need to provide separate policies in relation to these un-designated heritage assets over and above that contained in the Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework.</i></p> <p><i>Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service routinely advises that there should be early consultation of the Historic Environment Record and assessment of the archaeological potential of proposed sites at an appropriate stage in the design of new developments, in order that the requirements of the NPPF are met with regards to designated and non-designated heritage assets.</i></p>		
<b>Preferred Option SSP33 Parks and Gardens of Historic or Landscape Interest</b>				
7136 - Historic England (Sir/Madam) [744]	Support	We welcome the inclusion of this policy and support its content.	Support noted.	No change
6683 - Easton Parish Council (Mrs Sue Piggott) [3509]	Support	The listing of Easton in the Historical Parks Local list to ensure significance of importance within Policy	Support noted.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>7.13</b>	7129 - Historic England (Sir/Madam) [744]	Comment It is acknowledged that there is local support for a Local List to be produced as highlighted under 7.13 on page 104 and that a set of criteria has been produced as technical guidance to assist on determining what is a non-designated heritage asset. We would strongly recommend and support the production of a Local List. In addition to the production of a Local List the council should consider the inclusion of specific policies on the Local List to ensure greater weight is given to the protection of buildings on the Local List within decision taking.	Comment noted. The suggestion for additional policies would only apply once a local list has been drawn up. The Council is not at that point yet. It is a matter which could usefully be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.	No change
<b>7.14</b>	6861 - Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]	Comment Delete reference to amending boundary - please refer to representations within Site Employment Allocations section 3 for more detail.	Comment noted. This matter is dealt with more specifically under policy SSP18. An additional reference is appropriate under paragraph 7.14	Amend paragraph 7.14 to read: A significant part of the east of the district is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to which Core Strategy policy SP15 Landscape and Townscape applies. The Council is a member of the AONB Partnership working collaboratively with other organisations to deliver objectives within the AONB Management Plan. It is not within the remit of the Council or the AONB Board to amend the boundary of the designated AONB. However..."
7065 - Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council (Mrs Marian Rose) [2722]	Comment Page 104 -Natural Environment AONB refers to Special Landscape Areas, including many river valleys, including Historic Parkland [see also page 103]. We cannot see reference to the River Orwell in this section. If our observation is correct, shouldn't this River be included in this section?	<i>Add reference to the Council being a member of the AONB Partnership, working collaboratively with other organisations to deliver objectives within the AONB Management Plan.</i>	The River Orwell is not a designated Special Landscape Area.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7190 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club [3914]	Object	<p>objects to the wording of this paragraph and would request a reference be inserted into this paragraph promoting the redevelopment of the existing CDC site for sensitively designed forms of housing as enabling development linked to the sensitive redevelopment of Waldringfield Heath Golf Club.</p>	<p>This rep is one of a number which promotes enabling development of land at Waldringfield Heath Golf Club and adjacent employment sites. It is the Council's view that this proposal which crosses between the Site Allocations document area and that covered by the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan is most appropriately pursued direct via a planning application. A specific reference in respect of paragraph 7.14 is not appropriate</p>	No change
<p><i>A reference be inserted into this paragraph promoting the redevelopment of the existing CDC site for sensitively designed forms of housing as enabling development linked to the sensitive redevelopment of WHGC.</i></p>				
<b>Preferred Option SSP34 Special Landscape Areas</b>		<p>6680 - Martlesham Parish Council (Mrs Susan Robertson) [486]</p> <p>Object</p> <p>Special Landscape areas ( Martlesham has a large area covered by this topic as it includes The Fynn Valley). The emphasis in the proposed policy has shifted to development being acceptable subject to minimisation of impact, rather than development not taking place which would materially detract. We object to this proposed change and request a more strongly worded policy is retained.</p>	<p>Agreed. The emphasis of the policy needs to change to put the onus on the applicant to demonstrate why a development proposal may be acceptable.</p>	<p>Reword the policy to read: The valleys and tributaries of the Rivers Alde, Blyth, Deben, Fynn, Hundred, Mill, Minsmere, Ore and Yox and the Parks and Gardens of Historic or Landscape Interest identified in policy SSP37 are designated as Special Landscape Areas and shown on the Policies Map. Development will not be permitted in these areas where it would have a material adverse impact on the qualities of the landscape that make it special. Where development is considered acceptable landscape improvements should be included as an integral part of the development proposal.</p>
7001 - Hopkins Homes (Mr Robert Eburne) [2704]	Object	<p>SLA designations are a legacy of the Suffolk County Structure Plan which was out of date several years ago. Since the creation of this local designation, national planning policy has been revised to advise against local designations. There is no new evidence to underpin the restrictions and negative impact on development created by this policy. It is unacceptable to simply replace an old policy without proper review of the reason, justification and boundaries of such a designation. It is unacceptable to maintain this designation whilst recognising that it is out of date.</p> <p><i>delete policy SSP34 and associated text or conduct a full review of the SLA areas now.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. SLAs will be reviewed, but being a wider than district designation it is more appropriate that this is undertaken as part of the joint or aligned Local Plan Review. Policy SSP34 provides the geographic extent to Core Strategy policy SP15 in relation to Special Landscape Areas</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6883 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Object	This latest policy is much weaker than the previous policy.	Agreed. The emphasis of the policy needs to change to put the onus on the applicant to demonstrate why a development proposal may be	Reword the policy to read: The valleys and tributaries of the Rivers Alde, Blyth, Deben, Fynn, Hundred, Mill, Minsmere, Ore and Yox and the Parks and Gardens of Historic or Landscape Interest identified in policy SSP37 are designated as Special Landscape Areas and shown on the Policies Map. Development will not be permitted in these areas where it would have a material adverse impact on the qualities of the landscape that make it special. Where development is considered acceptable landscape improvements should be included as an integral part of the development proposal.
		<i>Keep existing policy wording which is much stronger</i>		
7032 - Aldeburgh Society (Mr Tony Bone) [3834]	Support	The Society supports the protection of the Alde Valley as an SLA.	Support noted.	No change

**7.17**

6884 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Support	It is vital that these areas remain protected	Support noted.	No change
-------------------------------------	---------	---	----------------	-----------

**7.20**

6886 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Object	It is vital that AP28 remains in place as a saved policy with adequate weight given to it in areas producing a neighbourhood plan to avoid unwanted development whilst the neighbourhood plans are being considered	Agree. AP28 will remain "saved" until superseded by relevant Neighbourhood Plans. A list of those "saved" policies to be superseded/replaced on adoption of this Plan will be included in the Appendices. A separate list of policies that remain "saved" will be published on the Council's website at the appropriate time.	No change
<i>AP28 to remain as a saved policy being given adequate weight in decision making until such time as a neighbourhood plan is in place giving these areas protection under a neighbourhood plan policy.</i>				

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6752 - Shallish Associates Limited (Mr Andrew Shallish) [927]	Object	<p>To state that "development within these areas will be severely restricted" is contrary to the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Furthermore, it applies a degree of protection to such areas that goes beyond the constraints that are applied to development within Conservation Areas and within the grounds of listed buildings, both of which are required to be protected by statute. Indeed, it goes beyond control exercised in Green Belt where, even there, new buildings are allowed in certain circumstances.</p> <p>The policy's strict restriction on development allows no flexibility. This is an unreasonable tier of restriction</p>	<p>Conservation areas and green belt areas are much wider in terms of their geographic extent. These Areas to be Protected from Development are much smaller in scale and their importance to the character and setting of a settlement is therefore much greater as would be the impact of development if it were to occur.</p>	No change
<i>Preferred Option SSP35 Areas to be Protected from Development</i>				
7066 - Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council (Mrs Marian Rose) [2722]	Comment	<p>Built Environment - Areas to be Protected from Development. This reinforces the status and protection afforded by the Hierarchy of Settlements, including Levington and Stratton Hall, which cannot sustain development. If developments should ever be favoured, whether residential or employment, they would seriously jeopardise this carefully balanced hierarchy of communities.</p> <p>We therefore see any developments eastwards from Ipswich, beyond the A12/A14 road, as a risk to the valued green space between Ipswich and Felixstowe.</p>	Comments noted.	No change
6609 - Mr John Hambley [3473]	Comment	<p>The largely wooded area containing two houses which has been selected for protection is wisely chosen; but it would seem equally sensible to extend the protected area to include the three large plots* to the east, currently containing 3 houses but also many mature trees to the south and east of the buildings. They make an essential contribution to the setting of this edge of the village, and link with the AONB area to the south as indicated on the plans</p> <p><i>Give consideration in relation to Snape to extending the area to be protected from development eastwards to the natural north/south boundary of Priory Road.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. The land referred to comprises three large residential plots which are of a different character to the mainly wooded area which is currently identified as an Area to be Protected from Development. The key characteristic of an APD is its undeveloped form.</p>	No change

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
6867 - Bromeswell Parish Council (Mr Robert Cutts) [2991]	Comment	<p>Land for 1km outside the boundaries of a Conservation Area should automatically given AP28 status to preserve the setting of our built environment.</p> <p><i>Land for 1km outside the boundaries of a Conservation Area should automatically given AP28 status to preserve the setting of our built environment.</i></p>	<p>Conservation area appraisals identify land outside of settlement boundaries which is considered important to the setting of the conservation area. A blanket approach is inflexible and unjustified</p>	No change
6681 - Martlesham Parish Council (Mrs Susan Robertson) [486]	Comment	<p>It is noted that the areas in Martlesham to be protected from development can be identified in the Neighbourhood Plan but the Council considers that this new policy is weaker than saved policy AP28 and strongly recommends that the former wording or similar is retained.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The commentary provided in policy SP15 Landscape and Townscape which this policy is intended to implement makes specific reference to "sites, gaps, gardens and spaces that make an important contribution to a particular location in their undeveloped form". A similar reference would add weight to SSP35</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 7.18 to read: "...until re-considered under the various site allocations documents. SSP15 describes these areas as "sites, gaps, gardens and spaces that make an important contribution to a particular location in their undeveloped form".</p> <p>Amend policy SSP35 to read: Areas to be protected from development as identified on the Policies Map comprise local scale sites, gaps, gardens and spaces that make an important contribution to the character and setting of a settlement in their undeveloped form. Accordingly, development within these will be severely restricted.</p>
6674 - Wickham Market Parish Council (Mr Richard Jenkinson) [3106]	Comment	<p>Lastly we wish you to consider making the Glebe Allotment Gardens an "Area to be Protected from Development". The Village feel very strongly that this area (site 776i) should not be developed and it is currently designated as an "An Asset of Community Value".</p>	<p>Wickham Market is now designated a neighbourhood plan area. It will be for the Parish Council through its neighbourhood plan work to take this suggestion forward</p>	No change
6885 - Councillor John Kelso [3836]	Object	Current policy seems weaker than the original policy	<p>Comment noted. Martlesham Parish Council has made the same point. Changes are suggested against their representation.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 7.18 to read: "...under the various site allocations documents. SSP15 describes these areas as "sites, gaps, gardens and spaces that make an important contribution to a particular location in their undeveloped form".</p> <p>Amend policy SSP35 to read: Areas to be protected from development as identified on the Policies Map comprise local scale sites, gaps, gardens and spaces that make an important contribution to the character and setting of a settlement in their undeveloped form. Accordingly, development within these will be severely restricted.</p>
<i>Revert to wording of policy AP28</i>				

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6753 - Shallish Associates Limited (Mr Andrew Shallish) [927]	Object	<p>The current Policy AP28 contains, quite reasonably, a degree of flexibility within its wording. Firstly, it contains the word "normally". Secondly, it allows a judgement to be made in terms of whether development "would materially detract from the character and appearance of" the relevant areas.</p> <p>This has resulted in a number of sustainably located sites being successfully developed for housing, thereby making a contribution to the housing requirements of the District and enabling people to live within successful and attractive communities/environments. In this respect, the related Preferred Options Interim Sustainability Report completely ignores the disbenefit of preventing such development.</p>	<p>Comments noted. In response to other comments made, amendments are proposed to paragraph 2.18 and policy SSP35 which adds reference to the fact that these areas are identified for their importance to the character and setting of settlements in their undeveloped form.</p>	No change but see suggested amendments to paragraph 7.18 and policy SSP35
7600 - Gladman Developments (Mr Peter Dutton) [3955]	Object	<p>Gladman object to the proposals of Preferred Policy SSP35 and submit that use of protected development areas will only serve to restrict otherwise sustainable proposals from going ahead. Rather than seeking to impose blanket restrictions on development in these locations, we submit that the Council should be looking to advance a more permissive policy that allows each planning application to be considered on its own merits, through a criteria-based approach. Gladman note that there is no specific support for protected development areas in national planning guidance.</p> <p><i>Changes to Plan:</i>  <i>Gladman submit that policies that place a blanket restriction on development are fundamentally contrary to the ethos of the Framework. In this respect we refer the Council to a High Court decision in respect of North Devon District Councils, which highlights that proposals such as protected development areas conflict with the Framework by failing to allow for the proper planning balance it advocates to be carried out.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. The size and scale of the areas identified to be protected from development are small and it is the contribution that they make in their undeveloped form which has been identified as important. The scale is therefore significantly different from that set out in the judgement referred to. The policy makes reference to development severely restricted. It does not provide a total rejection. The policy provides the geographic expression of policy SP15 which has been found to be NPPF compliant</p>	No change
7033 - Aldeburgh Society (Mr Tony Bone) [3834]	Support	<p>The Society supports the retention of AP 28 as SSP35, especially as regards the Garrett Era Area, and welcomes the amplification of SSP37, which will maintain the necessary protection, and anticipates the added strength that the protection will achieve if it does eventually also become a Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Support noted. However the Garrett Era Area is provided with its own policy. Its inclusion in addition as an Area to be Protected from Development is not appropriate.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6684 - Easton Parish Council (Mrs Sue Piggott) [3509]	Support	The additional proposed area to be protected from development marked on the physical and conservation boundaries map on 'The Street' - site of the Hunt Kennels and Village Hall.	Support noted.	Add additional text to this section "Easton: The area around the kennels at Easton which is identified through the conservation area appraisal"
<i>Preferred Option SSP36 Newbourne: Former Land Settlement Association Holdings</i>				
7478 - Mr Nicholas Packer [4003]	Comment	Newbourne should be designated as a service centre, it has the same facilities as Badingham & Bawdsey to meet the requirements. There is a lot of small plots of derelict land in Newbourne available for development.	Comments noted. It is not within the remit of the Site Allocations Document to change where individual settlements sit within the adopted Settlement Hierarchy.	No change
6962 - Mr Tony Finch [3869]	Comment	A look at No 11 Ipswich Road would show this policy is broken  The original house was demolished and the replacement dwelling is not in keeping with the design brief	Comments noted. In response to this and other comments it is clear that there are mixed views as to whether the policy should still apply and whether there is still any demand for the large plots to be used for horticultural type use. The implications for the removal of this policy are significant. The recommendation is therefore that the policy is retained at present, but this issue, is specifically flagged for wider discussion with the Parish Council through the Local Plan Review.	No change
7476 - Mr Neil Boucher [4002]	Object	All villages need to grow with time and should not be left behind neighbouring villages or the world. There should be controlled expansion of the village of say 50 dwellings spread throughout the village over the next 10 years with features and designed in-keeping with the properties that are here. With this in mind the village will maintain its past uniqueness and be growing with the rest of Britain. There is no harm at all on large plots of land that people should not be allowed to expand their dwelling, it is not an encroachment on neighbours.	Comments noted. In response to this and other comments it is clear that there are mixed views as to whether the policy should still apply and whether there is still any demand for the large plots to be used for horticultural type use. The implications for the removal of this policy are significant. The recommendation is therefore that the policy is retained at present, but this issue, is specifically flagged for wider discussion with the Parish Council through the Local Plan Review. The Local Plan Review is also the correct mechanism for debate as to where Newbourne sits within the Settlement Hierarchy. At present it is identified as an Other Village with very little scope for new development.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7465 - K Baynes [3994]	Object	<p>From the mid seventies until 1983 things went from bad to worse. The Land Settlement finally closed the village holdings down - plus the Packing Shed. Ten growers started a second co-operative which finally closed 4 years later. The Packing Shed no longer exists.</p> <p>I ended the last 11 years prior to my retirement growing for Notcutts of Woodbridge as growing tomatoes and lettuce was no longer viable.</p> <p>Horticulture in this village is finished. What little is grown is on its way out.</p>	Comments noted. In response to this and other comments it is clear that there are mixed views as to whether the policy should still apply and whether there is still any demand for the large plots to be used for horticultural type use. The implications for the removal of this policy are significant. The recommendation is therefore that the policy is retained at present, but this issue, is specifically flagged for wider discussion with the Parish Council through the Local Plan Review.	No change
7487 - P & L Sample [4011]	Object	<p>Strong objection. They appear to be trying to keep the village as it was but it is too late it has already changed vastly and the only people that can afford these houses now have very well paid jobs and not young couples with family's which is what the village needs to keep it alive.</p> <p>This I find to be very one sided and will penalize the people that have not added extensions already you cannot grant 80% and then say no to the other 20%.</p>	Comments noted. In response to this and other comments it is clear that there are mixed views as to whether the policy should still apply and whether there is still any demand for the large plots to be used for horticultural type use. The implications for the removal of this policy are significant. The recommendation is therefore that the policy is retained at present, but this issue, is specifically flagged for wider discussion with the Parish Council through the Local Plan Review.	No change
6784 - Mr David Eagle [3798]	Support	Supports the policy	Support noted	No change
7077 - Mr Phil Wilson [328]	Support	<p>The village is poorly serviced by public transport. There are already 2000 houses going up at Martlesham - this should meet the demand, and if not then it could be expanded rather than spoiling Newbourne.</p> <p>Houses would be too close together on some smallholdings which will be unfair to the existing houses.</p> <p>In-fill is not what we want.</p>	Comments noted. In response to this and other comments it is clear that there are mixed views as to whether the policy should still apply and whether there is still any demand for the large plots to be used for horticultural type use. The implications for the removal of this policy are significant. The recommendation is therefore that the policy is retained at present, but this issue, is specifically flagged for wider discussion with the Parish Council through the Local Plan Review.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>				
6963 - Mr Tony Finch [3869]	Object	This does not address the needs of the village.	It is not appropriate to amend the settlement hierarchy through the Site Allocations document. Any changes to the settlement hierarchy will be reconsidered as part of the early review of the Core Strategy.	No change
<i>Newbourne should be placed in the category of Local Service Centre so that some extra growth is possible</i>				
7043 - Liberal Democrat Members (Cllr Christine Block) [3375]	Comment	<p>It is unclear if or how the Vulnerability Assessment and the 30m landward line will accommodate flood risk at the mouth of the estuaries.</p> <p>The extent of land ( flood cell ) which could be at risk of coastal flooding may not correspond to a 30m landward line / area covered by a Vulnerability Assessment ( as at East Lane Bawdsey / Shingle Street and Felixstowe Ferry. )</p> <p>There is some doubt about a 30m line which seems to ignore the EA's use of the 5m contour to indicate potential flood risk .</p>	<p>The CCMA line does not coincide with an EA flood risk zone boundary which is not a failing of the two separate assessment processes. The two lines mean different things and should not necessarily coincide. E.g. at Southwold the CCMA and FR zones co-exist with clarity and on occasion developers undertake both Flood and erosion risk assessments in a single document.</p> <p>The Plan states in 7.24 that a CCMA is identified only where there is a policy that allows coastal change within the Plan life. The SMP management policies for the coastline to either side of the Deben Estuary (SMP MU refs 17.2 and 17.4) is Hold the Line in all three epochs i.e. to 2105. Therefore, under the NPPF guidance, there should be no CCMA identified for this part and no need for CEVAs to be prepared here. The estuary area is within SMP MU 17.3 which has a policy of Hold / Hold / Realign meaning retreat is allowed after 2055.</p> <p>2055 is beyond the Plan life. Therefore, there is no CCMA identified and no requirement for a CEVA to accompany development proposals.</p>	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7052 - Deben Estuary Partnership (Christine Block) [2600]	Comment	<p>It is unclear if or how the Vulnerability Assessment and the 30m landward line will accommodate flood risk at the mouth of the estuaries.</p> <p>The extent of land ( flood cell ) which could be at risk of coastal flooding may not correspond to a 30m landward line / area covered by a Vulnerability Assessment ( as at East Lane Bawdsey / Shingle Street and Felixstowe Ferry. )</p> <p>There is some doubt about a 30m line which seems to ignore the EA's use of the 5m contour to indicate potential flood risk .</p>	<p>The CEVA deals only with erosion risk. The flood risk is dealt with separately.</p> <p>The CCMA line does not coincide with an EA flood risk zone boundary which is not a failing of the two separate assessment processes. The two lines mean different things and should not necessarily coincide. E.g. at Southwold the CCMA and FR zones co-exist with clarity and on occasion developers undertake both Flood and erosion risk assessments in a single document.</p> <p>The Plan states in 7.24 that a CCMA is identified only where there is a policy that allows coastal change within the Plan life. The SMP management policies for the coastline to either side of the Deben Estuary (SMP MU refs 17.2 and 17.4) is Hold the Line in all three epochs i.e. to 2105. Therefore, under the NPPF guidance, there should be no CCMA identified for this part and no need for CEVAs to be prepared here. The estuary area is within SMP MU 17.3 which has a policy of Hold / Hold / Realign meaning retreat is allowed after 2055.</p> <p>2055 is beyond the Plan life. Therefore, there is no CCMA identified and no requirement for a CEVA to accompany development proposals.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6870 - Mr Mike Chandler [3835]	Object	<p>1. Ambiguity of CCMA Maps</p> <p>The Coastal Change Management Area Maps in Appendix 6c do not have legends to explain the meaning of the coloured areas in relation to the Coastal Change Maps in Appendix C Annex 1 of the SMP. Boundaries of the CCMA are not shown in relation to the individual shoreline policy designations in the PDZ sections of the SMP.</p> <p>Section 7.32 of the consultation document states the CEVA requirements within 30m landward of the 100 year SMP line. It would be clearer to use the SMP map or quote the SMP map references. The CCMA map red line is ambiguous and includes roads and parts of houses. It may be better to avoid it given possible concern that it represents a change to the SMP.</p> <p>2. Links to SMP documents</p> <p>When Section 8 of the SMP was created the link <a href="http://www.suffolksmmp2.org.uk/policy2/index.php">www.suffolksmmp2.org.uk/policy2/index.php</a> was adopted to ensure awareness of revisions because changes are not marked elsewhere in the SMP documents. Section 8 has a continue to SMP button. The link <a href="http://www.suffolksmmp2.org.uk/policy2/smp7index.php">http://www.suffolksmmp2.org.uk/policy2/smp7index.php</a> in section 7.27 of the consultation document allows the full index to be seen without alerting people to possible changes. However at present only Revision A exists.</p>	<p>Agreed. Point 1. Additional clarity will be provided through the addition of a legend. The relationship between Coastal Change maps in the SAASP doc and the SMP will be reviewed.</p> <p>Point 2. The correct link will be inserted at the appropriate section of the SAASP doc.</p> <p>It is important to note that the SMP may alter overtime and so link in Plan should be to correct SMP version.</p>	<p>Provide additional clarity through the addition of a legend to the maps. The relationship between Coastal Change maps in the SAASP doc and the SMP will be reviewed.</p> <p>The correct link will be inserted at the appropriate section of the SAASP doc.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7.33	Comment 7044 - Liberal Democrat Members (Cllr Christine Block) [3375] 7053 - Deben Estuary Partnership (Christine Block) [2600]	The reference to proposals for privately funded works to defend coastal land being assessed in order to identify potential impacts .... should also reference works in the tidal reaches of the estuaries - otherwise it may appear that defences within estuaries - which, in some areas, are likely to be privately funded - do not require to be technically sound and sustainable.	The graphical extent over which the powers apply are defined in the CPA. In the case of the Deben the limit is seaward of a line drawn across the Ferry and so the estuary would be excluded. SCDC does not have powers under the CPA for all estuary frontages. It is necessary for estuary work to be sound but is not relevant to this 'coastal clause.'	Recommendation: Insert the following text in 7.36 after the sentence ...and flood risk is provided by the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency is designated as a risk management authority under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. Under the Act, the Environment Agency is responsible for taking a strategic overview of the management of all sources of flooding, has operational responsibility for managing the risk of flooding from main rivers, reservoirs, estuaries and the sea, and has powers to designate structures and features that affect flooding in order to safeguard assets that are relied upon for flood risk management. More detail is provided in 'Living on the Edge - Guidance for riparian owners' (Environment Agency website).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Preferred Option SSP38 - Coastal Change Management Area</i>				
6860 - Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Paula Booth) [3763]	Comment	<p>Impact on the environment in this context is interpreted as impact on statutory and non-statutory nature conservation interests and the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB. Proposals must give due regard to the purposes of AONB designation and seek to avoid significant adverse impact on landscape character and special qualities. To help inform our response to coastal management proposals in future, specialist advice has been commissioned by Touching the Tide. 'An Assessment of Potential Coast Defence Solutions in Relation to their Potential Landscape and Visual Impacts in the Suffolk Coast &amp; Heaths AONB', (available April 2016). In addition, the recently published 'Natural Beauty &amp; Special Qualities Indicators' document should be taken into account when considering proposals for coastal defence projects.</p> <p>Clarity required re. what is meant by Environmental Impact in this context.</p> <p>Consider potential impacts of sea defences on Natural Beauty and Special Qualities of the AONB. Specialist advice currently in preparation, available April 2016 to inform response to proposals in terms of potential landscape and visual impacts on the AONB.</p>	Noted.	<p>Add the following text to 7.24: With regards impact on the environment, additional advice can be found in Touching the Tide. 'An Assessment of Potential Coast Defence Solutions in Relation to their Potential Landscape and Visual Impacts in the Suffolk Coast &amp; Heaths AONB', (available April 2016).</p> <p>In addition, the recently published 'Natural Beauty &amp; Special Qualities Indicators' document should be taken into account when considering proposals for coastal defence projects.</p>
7231 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	<p>We welcome the approach to development in the coastal zone as detailed in paragraphs 7.24 - 7.33. We agree with the types of development proposed to be permitted in the short, medium and long term erosion zones as an appropriate balance of needs against inevitable coastal change. We would suggest that the Policy should make specific reference to the development types as described in paragraph 7.30.</p>	<p>The list of development types listed in 7.30 is not definitive and therefore, is more appropriately discussed in the document text.</p>	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7042 - Liberal Democrat Members (Cllr Christine Block) [3375]	Comment	Pages 109 + SSP38 Coastal Change Management Areas and Flooding A* No distinction / reference is made to flooding within estuaries and the role of Estuary Management Plans in informing flood risk management within estuaries ( cf as coastal management is dealt with in SMPs ) B* Coastal change and estuary management are interrelated at the mouth of estuaries.- here risk of flooding may be exacerbated if estuary defences are not maintained	A There is a separate requirement for flood risk to be assessed which is in Plan parts 7.35 - 7.39. The question arises is there a need to make a specific comment on combined flood and erosion risk assessment at estuaries (as part of a CEVA) and to give other documents such as Estuary Management Plans EMP a similar status to SMPs. There may be merit in ref EMPs as background however the Plan identifies the EA as the key advising body on flood risk and their flood risk maps as key reference documents. It is therefore expect EMP findings to be reflected in updates to those maps and also inform EA advice to applicants on flood risk.	No change.
7051 - Deben Estuary Partnership (Christine Block) [2600]	Comment	Pages 109 + SSP38 Coastal Change Management Areas and Flooding A* No distinction / reference is made to flooding within estuaries and the role of Estuary Management Plans in informing flood risk management within estuaries ( cf as coastal management is dealt with in SMPs )  B * Coastal change and estuary management are interrelated at the mouth of estuaries.- here risk of flooding may be exacerbated if estuary defences are not maintained	A There is a separate requirement for flood risk to be assessed which is in Plan parts 7.35 - 7.39. The question arises is there a need to make a specific comment on combined flood and erosion risk assessment at estuaries (as part of a CEVA) and to give other documents such as Estuary Management Plans EMP a similar status to SMPs. There may be merit in ref EMPs as background however the Plan identifies the EA as the key advising body on flood risk and their flood risk maps as key reference documents. It is therefore expect EMP findings to be reflected in updates to those maps and also inform EA advice to applicants on flood risk.	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>	
6869 - Mr Mike Chandler [3835]	Object	<p>1. Ambiguity of CCMA Maps The Coastal Change Management Area Maps in Appendix 6c do not have legends to explain the meaning of the coloured areas in relation to the Coastal Change Maps in Appendix C Annex 1 of the SMP. Boundaries of the CCMA are not shown in relation to the individual shoreline policy designations in the PDZ sections of the SMP.</p> <p>Section 7.32 of the consultation document states the CEVA requirements within 30m landward of the 100 year SMP line. It would be clearer to use the SMP map or quote the SMP map references. The CCMA map red line is ambiguous and includes roads and parts of houses. It may be better to avoid it given possible concern that it represents a change to the SMP.</p> <p>2. Links to SMP documents When Section 8 of the SMP was created the link <a href="http://www.suffolkmp2.org.uk/policy2/index.php">www.suffolkmp2.org.uk/policy2/index.php</a> was adopted to ensure awareness of revisions because changes are not marked elsewhere in the SMP documents. Section 8 has a continue to SMP button. The link <a href="http://www.suffolkmp2.org.uk/policy2/smp7index.php">http://www.suffolkmp2.org.uk/policy2/smp7index.php</a> in section 7.27 of the consultation document allows the full index to be seen without alerting people to possible changes. However at present only Revision A exists.</p>	Agree.	<p>Provide additional clarity through the addition of a legend to the maps. The relationship between Coastal Change maps in the SAASP doc and the SMP will be reviewed.</p>	<p>The correct link will be inserted at the appropriate section of the SAASP doc.</p>

#### *Preferred Option SSP39 - Relocation and Replacement of Development Affected by Coastal Erosion Risk*

7054 - Deben Estuary Partnership (Christine Block) [2600]	Comment	<p>Page 114 SSP39 Bullet points listed under 'In all cases' * 'The proposal should result in no adverse effect upon the landscape, townscape or biodiversity of the area' Other Plans refer to the effect of proposals on the view of the land from a river or the sea and the view of water from the land - important to the Suffolk coast.</p>	<p>The policy requires that no adverse effect should result upon the landscape, townscape or biodiversity of the area. This does not exclude views across rivers and estuaries being considered in this requirement. It may be impractical to routinely undertake assessments of coastal development as seen from the sea due to access difficulties.</p>	No change.
---	---------	--	---	------------

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7232 - The Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Hunter) [543]	Comment	We welcome this approach to reduce the number of assets at risk along the vulnerable sections of coast. We are particularly supportive of the proposal to allow new replacement development outside the long term erosion zones.	Noted.	No change.
7045 - Liberal Democrat Members (Cllr Christine Block) [3375]	Comment	Bullet points listed under 'In all cases' * 'The proposal should result in no adverse effect upon the landscape, townscape or biodiversity of the area' Other Plans refer to the effect of proposals on the view of the land from a river or the sea and the view of water from the land - important to the Suffolk coast.	The policy requires that no adverse effect should result upon the landscape, townscape or biodiversity of the area. This does not exclude views across rivers and estuaries being considered in this requirement. It may be impractical to routinely undertake assessments of coastal development as seen from the sea due to access difficulties.	No change.
7.38	Comment	While we are generally supportive of this section, we would point out that the statement in paragraph 7.38: "The Site Allocations Document does not propose any future development or intensification on sites which are within flood zones 2 and 3" is not correct. As highlighted above, a number of sites do include elements of Flood Zone 2 & 3, which will need to be appropriately considered as part of any development proposals. This will include applying the sequential approach, and directing development within the site away from those areas at risk wherever possible.	Agree. Add wording to flood risk section to outline approach where allocation sites include elements of flood zone 2 or 3.	Reword paragraph 7.38 to read:  Where site allocations include areas of flood zone 2 or 3, proposals for development on these sites will need to consider flood risk appropriately. This will include applying the sequential approach and directing development within the site away from those areas at risk wherever possible. Where necessary, it will be for the applicant, in partnership with the Environment Agency to consider the introduction of appropriate flood mitigation measures.

Representations	Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<b>APPENDIX 1 Current Status of Neighbourhood Plans</b>			
<b>APPENDIX 1 Current Status of Neighbourhood Plans</b>			
7200 - Suffolk Preservation Society (Linda Cockburn) [3919]	Comment Concern that where neighbourhood plans are some way from being adopted as policy this will leave these settlements vulnerable to ad hoc development as the local planning policy framework within which planning decisions should be taken will not be in place	Comments noted. The adopted Core Strategy provides policy guidance with regard to the scale and distribution of development. The site allocations documents provides additional detail with regard to the minimum amount of new housing those neighbourhood plans will be required to provide. Decisions on planning applications will be made having regard to adopted and emerging policy.	No change
7207 - Hacheston Parish Council (Mr Bartholomew Hall) [3513]	Comment The Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document needs to be considered alongside neighbourhood plans, such as Framlingham. The Hacheston Parish Council has not yet seen or been asked to comment on the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan; we need to see the plan before full comment on matters related to planning such as traffic, road access, parking, local facilities, can be made. There are also sections on the economy and retail that impact Framlingham. However, there is no detail about Framlingham as it appears that this will be considered in Framlingham's Neighbourhood Plan (designated a Neighbourhood Plan Area).	Comments noted. Whilst Framlingham will contain policies for its parish area, the District Council does, retain an overview of cumulative impacts of development across the district. It does so in conjunction with other relevant organisations such as the County Council in its role as highway authority.	No change
6677 - Martlesham Parish Council (Mrs Susan Robertson) [486]	Comment The Council has serious concerns that this disadvantages councils who have an approved NP boundary since, in the intervening period where SCDC saved policies are now being given less weight & parishes have not completed their NPs, it potentially leaves those particular parishes more open to speculative development than if they had not gone down the NP route. We request that saved policies remain in place until NPs (where boundaries have been approved) can effectively replace them.	The concerns raised are noted. The adopted Core Strategy does provide up to date policies with regard to the scale and distribution of housing ahead of site specific plans being adopted or "made".	No change
		There are a number of saved policies that it will be appropriate to retain until such time as they are superseded by Neighbourhood Plans, including AP28, AP212 and AP214 relating to Martlesham. The Site Allocations document will include a list in the Appendices of all those saved policies that it will supersede on adoption. The remaining saved policies to be superseded by Neighbourhood Plans will be published in a separate document on the Council's website at the appropriate time.	

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7138 - Historic England (Sir/Madam) [744]	Comment	Request from Historic England to notify all towns and parishes undertaking neighbourhood plans that they would welcome both informal and formal discussions on these plans	Request noted and will be actioned.	No change
7024 - Christchurch Property Company Limited [2980]	Object	There is a danger that the Site Allocations document will cover just those areas not covered by Neighbourhood Plan Area designations. This is potentially an unsatisfactory basis to deliver strategic planning policies in situations where Neighbourhood Plans do not plan positively in accordance with the Framework.	The adopted Core Strategy provides the strategic framework for both the site allocations documents and neighbourhood plans. The site allocations document provides a more detailed breakdown in terms of housing numbers that the neighbourhood plans are required to provide as a minimum.	No change
7409 - S. P. Harris [2121]	Object	How are sites previously objected to, being dealt with under neighbourhood plans.	Details of comments received at the Issues and Options stage have been passed to the relevant town / parish council for their information. It will be for neighbourhood plans, as they progress, to engage with their local communities with regard to alternative options for new development. The Site Allocations Document confirms the amount of housing each neighbourhood plan area is being required to provide (as a minimum). Timetables will vary for each neighbourhood plan. This does not prevent developers or landowners submitting planning applications at any time which the District council is duty bound to determine assuming that all relevant information has been provided to it.	No change
7427 - Framlingham Town Council (Mrs Eileen Coe) [3557]	Support	Supports the statement 'Framlingham is a "designated Neighbourhood Plan area". We support this statement and confirm that site allocations for Framlingham are included in the Neighbourhood Plan	Support noted	No change

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<b>APPENDIX 2 - "Saved" policies - replaced or deleted</b>				
<b>APPENDIX 2 - "Saved" policies - replaced or deleted</b>				
7046 - Liberal Democrat Members (Cllr Christine Block) [3375]	Comment	<p>Policy AP165 Deben Peninsula : East Lane, Bawdsey - future sustainable management of this area is still under discussion. Reference to policy having been implemented may therefore not be appropriate.</p> <p>Policies AP191 and AP241 relate to houseboats. The Deben Estuary Plan notes the character that houseboats bring to parts of the river but puts forward guidelines which aim to establish common criteria across the whole estuary. At the moment policies cover Melton / Woodbridge and Felixstowe Ferry but ignore houseboats at Martlesham Creek.</p> <p>Houseboat guidelines/policy might be addressed through the developing Neighbourhood Plans but need to be co-ordinated.</p>	<p>AP165. Comment noted. A new tourist centre has recently been granted planning permission closer to Bawdsey Quay, for which it is understood funding is being sought. Any other interpretation material at East Lane Bawdsey would be expected to be in the form of information boards which would not require specific allocation in this plan. Any issues with the protection of this area linked to coastal change would be covered under adopted policy SP30 and SSP38.</p> <p>A small car park and footpath network already exists at East Lane around the martello towers and former coastal defences.</p>	<p>Continue to identify saved policy AP165 as a policy to be superseded on adoption of the Site Allocations document as it is not longer required.</p>
7034 - Aldeburgh Society (Mr Tony Bone) [3834]	Comment	<p>The Garret Era Area should be retained as an area to be protected from development until there is a positive decision on the area becoming a Conservation Area.</p> <p>If delay occurs in the production of a Neighbourhood Plan for Aldeburgh then these policies should remain if and until such a plan is produced.</p>	<p>The GEA is of a different scale and nature to other areas to be protected from development. The policy as written is designed to ensure that the character of the area is maintained. Specific reference is included in policy SSP37 to the distinctive townscape character.</p> <p>Policy protection will continue to apply to this area until the old "saved" policy is superseded by a new policy in the Site Allocations Document. If the Town Council considered it necessary, any future Neighbourhood Plan for Aldeburgh could reconsider the policy protection for the area and revise and supersede the policy in the Site Allocations Document.</p>	No change
6997 - Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council (Mr Mel Bentley) [502]	Comment	How is saved policy AP228 Ipswich Fringe: Open Spaces near Rushmere Street to be dealt with? It is not referred to in the Preferred Options Document	The continuing relevance of this policy has been reconsidered. In recognition of its unique character, a new policy is now proposed.	Insertion of new policy and supporting text - SSP36.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7055 - Deben Estuary Partnership (Christine Block) [2600]	Comment	Under section 'How these policy issues are now being dealt with'-reference should be made to the endorsed Deben Estuary Plan for the following policies: AP191; AP241; AP249; AP252;	Comments noted. Appendix 2 is being revised for the Proposed Submission version document to list the saved policies that are to be superseded on adoption of the Site Allocations document. It is not necessary, or required, to refer to the policies or documents that are replacing saved policies. Appropriate references to the Deben Estuary Plan will continue to be made in the body of the Site Allocations document itself.  <i>Under section 'How these policy issues are now being dealt with'-reference should be made to the endorsed Deben Estuary Plan for the following policies: AP191; AP241; AP249; AP252;</i>	No change
7047 - Liberal Democrat Members (Cllr Christine Block) [3375]	Comment	All proposed sites in Shottisham have now been discounted leaving the Parish potentially starved of the additional houses which they believe will help to keep the village 'alive'.	Comment noted. Following discussion with the Parish Council one site is now identified for a mixed use housing/car parking development.	Insertion of new allocation policy SSP15.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7419 - Save our Country Spaces (MRS Barbara Robinson) [364]	Object	<p>The following saved policies should be retained. AP211 specifies the settlements most vulnerable and therefore gives specific protection not afforded via SP19.</p> <p>AP212 (not listed in document) Ipswich Fringe: Open character of land between Settlements.</p> <p>AP228 In respect of open land near Rushmere Street, see paras 13.109 and 13.110." should be respected and saved.</p>	<p>AP211 is considered to be adequately covered by adopted policy SP19 and associated policies. Site allocations documents policies H1 and H2 have regard to the individual character of settlements and their ability and capacity to accommodate new growth.</p> <p>AP212 is considered to be adequately covered by policy SP15 Landscape and Townscape. However, some areas highlighted within AP212 fall within designated neighbourhood plan areas. It will be for these neighbourhood plans to determine whether or not they would want to retain/ update this policy as it relates to their area.</p> <p>AP228 It is considered that this policy is no longer required as adopted Core Strategy policies would provide adequate alternative policy cover. Policy SP15 protects townscape and landscape; SP16 provides for appropriate provision, protection and enhancement of formal and informal sport and recreation facilities. Policy SP17 Green infrastructure may also be applicable. Policy DM32 Sport and Play would also apply.</p> <p>Therefore, policies AP211 and AP228 will continue to be identified for deletion on adoption of this Plan but AP212 will be saved until superseded by the relevant Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	<p>Retain policy AP212 as a saved policy until such time as it is superseded by the relevant Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Appendix 2 is to be updated and simplified to aid clarity and will merely list the policies to be deleted / superseded on adoption of this Plan, as required by the Local Plan Regulations. A list of the remaining saved policies to be superseded by Neighbourhood Plans will be published on the website at the appropriate time.</p>
7422 - Aldeburgh Town Council (Ms Ruth Proctor) [1881]	Support	<p><i>Retain policies AP211; AP212 and AP228</i></p> <p>Endorse confirmation of the following 'Saved Policies': AP125, AP128, AP129, AP130, AP132, AP156 and commend the drafting of AP124 and its covering Site Allocations document.</p> <p>Consider the final number of 35 for Aldeburgh's housing allocation within the town's physical boundaries as dictated by the AONB over the next 10-12 years to be slightly high though if building of these was spread over the period to be covered, sustainable.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<b>APPENDIX 3 Tables of all sites considered as part of the Issues and Options</b>				
<b>APPENDIX 3 Tables of all sites considered as part of the Issues and Options</b>				
7468 - Mr Kenneth Parry Brown [3202]	Comment	<p>Site 400, Peasenhall</p> <p>This site remains the best site for development in the village of Peasenhall.</p> <p>It appears that the site has been withdrawn on the basis that it was reported that it is liable to flooding.</p> <p>The risk of surface water flooding is caused by the fact that a previous tenant had filled in the historic drainage ditch which ran from Puoy Street/Sibton Road to Sibton Green. The building of a drain would not only benefit the land but also drain the uncared-for ditch that runs along the side of Sibton Road and causes flooding regularly in that road.</p>	<p>SHLAA site 400 is effectively cut in half by floodzone 2. The sequential flooding test states that housing should not be allocated to floodzone 2 or 3 unless, there is a proven need for housing, and no alternative suitable sites are available.</p>	<p>Physical limits boundary adjusted to take in small part of site which relates well to existing built development.</p>
7137 - Historic England (Sir/ Madam) [744]	Comment	<p>It is acknowledged that a number of sites we originally had concerns over are no longer being put forward, such as 400, 518, 622, 672a, 680, 702 a-c, 982, 1009 and 3030 and this is welcomed.</p>	Noted.	No change.
6759 - Ufford Parish Council (Mrs Judi Hallett) [3285]	Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 21 - the 'Indicative Minimum Contribution figure should read 25 (based on the other figures in the table)</li> <li>2. Page 21 - why is the development of 34 houses at Crown Nursery not shown in this table?</li> <li>3. Page 144 - SHLAA Site Ref. 706 - Why does the commentary read 'preferred location for relocation of football and cricket grounds' when there has been no consultation with Ufford Parish Council or Ufford residents.</li> </ol>	<p>The indicative figure should read 25. This will be corrected.</p>	Correct and update Table 2
			<p>There are two permissions for new homes at Crown Nurseries. The first application for 10 units is included within the figure in column (B) in Table 2. The second application is for 31 units which was permitted after the base date for the plan (31/03/2015) a gain since 1/4/2015 of 21 units on this site.</p>	
			<p>The comment re site ref 706 should not have been included as referenced. There has been no decision in respect of the possible re-location of the football club and cricket club. The long term future of these sites has however been the subject of discussion and comment through the local press. Any proposals would be subject to public consultation. Site 706 was submitted for consideration as an employment site.</p>	

<b><i>Representations</i></b>	<b><i>Nature</i></b>	<b><i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i></b>	<b><i>Council's Assessment</i></b>	<b><i>Action</i></b>
6666 - Tunstall Parish Council (Mrs Judi Hallett) [3288]	Comment	<p>Parish Council is pleased that concerns around the three proposed development sites have been taken in to consideration.</p> <p>On page 144 'Plunketts Barn' is listed as a potential employment site however it is coloured in the deep pink indicating that it has been discounted. Is it identified as a potential employment site or has it been discounted?</p>	Comments noted. With regard to Plunketts Barns, these are incorrectly shown on the Inset Map as a general employment area. This is a drafting error.	Amend inset map for Tunstall to remove the general employment area designation from Plunketts Barns.
7041 - Westerfield Parish Council (Mr Peter Miller) [3597]	Comment	The Consultation Document comments in Column 5 Allocation Policy Reference should be transposed in respect of SHLAA site References 564 and 939 so that they refer to the correct sites.	Noted. This will be corrected in future documentation.	
7035 - Aldeburgh Society (Mr Tony Bone) [3834]	Comment	<p>Housing numbers for Aldeburgh agreed and accepted.</p> <p>New sites, 3035. No objections in principle to this proposed change to the physical limits subject to insistence on an exemplary standard of contemporary architecture at this vitally important visual entrance to Aldeburgh's built-up area</p>	Comments noted. The matters identified against site 3035 more appropriately dealt with at the planning application stage. It is not proposed to specifically allocate this site given its small size.	No change
7484 - Mrs R Pateman [3146]	Object	<p>Objects to the apparent inconsistent approach by the District Council to new housing development in Middleton and the continuing rejection of her site.</p> <p>Objection to lack of direct response to email letter.</p>	A separate response has been provided to the email. The physical limits boundary will be adjusted to include the whole of Mill House and its garden.	Amend physical limits boundary to include the whole of Hill House and its garden.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7003 - Hopkins Homes (Mr Robert Eburne) [2704]	Object	<p>Site 672a is adjacent to the village of Easton. This site is within successive SHLAA documents and is the only SHLAA site which the document does not allocate but has the following report about the sustainability of the site "SUSTAINABILITY No significant negative effects identified"</p> <p>It would seem that the only reason that the site is not to be allocated is because of the "Community concerns expressed". The site is the subject of a planning appeal for 14 dwellings which also includes an extension to the primary school grounds and a school car park and drop off area. The planning application was refused against the advice of officers and there is no evidence of a majority view that the proposal is not acceptable. Unreasonable and limited community objection to a proportionate and sustainable development could be reported on all proposed site allocations leading to no development at all.</p> <p><i>Reinstate draft allocation for Easton to reflect the proposals tables by Hopkins and Moore for 14 homes and a school car park.</i></p>	<p>As stated above, Easton SHLAA site 672a is subject to an appeal taken on DC/14/2244 (Appeal reference APP/J3530/W/15/3129322). It would be inappropriate to allocate a site for housing whilst a decision is at appeal. The plan will reflect the outcome of the appeal.</p>	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b>APPENDIX 6: Policy Maps</b>				
<i>Aldeburgh Policy Map inc Garrett Era Area</i>				
7406 - M.S. Oakes Ltd [3958]	Comment	<p>Notwithstanding the fact that the planning application should stand on its own merits, the Physical Limits to Aldeburgh should encompass the Brickfields site, a site which is equally if not more sustainable than Rose Hill (see App 4) , at the very least the area covered by the Certificate of Lawfulness should be included by virtue of the fact that it is a brownfield site i.e. land which is considered to be sequentially preferable for development</p>	<p>Comments noted. This site is the subject to a planning application (DC 15/3673/FUL). If the concerns identified in relation to this site through the plan preparation process to date can be overcome then it would be expected that the scheme would be granted planning permission. This document will reflect the decision made in respect of this application.</p>	No change.
<p>The planning application (DC 15/3673/FUL) includes the parcel of land to which the Certificate of Lawfulness applies. If the application fails, this plot of land is effectively landlocked by the planning permission on the adjacent site unless the scheme were to be amended to alter the car parking area to allow access to be achieved. This may or may not be possible. The adjacent site is included within the physical limits boundary for Aldeburgh.</p>				
<p><i>The area covered by the Certificate of Lawfulness should be included within the physical limits boundary by virtue of the fact that it is a brownfield site i.e. land which is considered to be sequentially preferable for development</i></p>				

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7413 - Bidwells (Laura Hunter) [3941]	Comment	<p>Land at Crag Pit Nurseries, Leiston Road, Aldeburgh. We believe our clients' site is best placed to accommodate residential development for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>The site is located approx. 0.9 miles to the north of the town centre directly off the B1122 Leiston Road on its eastern side. It lies on the edge of the built up area of the town amongst other low density residential development. A site plan is included at (Appendix 1). This plan shows outlined in red the whole site at some 9.23ha with a frontage to Leiston Road of some 200m. The area previously used for the extraction of crag ('The Pit') is annotated as 'Crag Pit Nurseries'. This lies approx. 2/2.5m below the level of the surrounding land reflecting the previous extraction. The rim of the 'cliff edge' is marked by trees and hedging. The remainder of the site is in agricultural use.</p> <p>The site has been assessed in the last two SHLAA's published by the Council. It was rejected as a housing site, but this was based on the assumption that the whole site would have to come forward. In our view if the assessment was solely of the Pit area it would point clearly to development potential. We say that for the following main reasons:</p> <p>i,* Visual impact from say a two storey development would be minor by virtue of the sunken nature of the site and boundary landscaping. In fact, the availability of the wider landholding within my client's control offers the potential for landscape enhancements that could significantly improve the natural beauty of the AONB by containing views of existing housing located on Leiston Road to the north and west of the site. These houses are currently visible from the coast.</p> <p>i,* It is well related to the built up area with housing to the north and west and a sewage pumping station to the south. Surrounding development is all located on much higher ground and is prominent within the AONB.</p> <p>i,* It has direct access to a main road with good sight lines and public transport provision. Leiston Road is served by pedestrian footways and direct bus services to the town centre.</p> <p>i,* A small part of the site is designated a SSSI for geological reasons. This is currently inaccessible and not maintained; a suitable development could enable</p>	<p>The sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development is designed to ensure that areas at little or no risk of flooding from any source are developed in preference to areas at higher risk. The aim should be to keep development out of medium and high flood risk areas (Flood Zones 2 and 3) and other areas affected by other sources of flooding where possible.</p> <p>All but 2.24 ha of SHLAA site 768 is located within Flood Zone 2 including presumed site access. The remainder of the site can only be accessed through land located in Flood Zone 2 or 3.</p>	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>enhancements to the condition of the SSSI, secure its future management and increase awareness of its importance in the local area, for the benefit of residents and tourism.</p> <p>1,* Although within flood zone 2 on the Environment Agency's flood risk maps, it is right on the edge of this designation. Further analysis is being undertaken to understand the actual degree of flood risk and how it could be mitigated, for the benefit of existing and future residents.</p> <p>1,* It is distant from the nature reserve to the east of the railway line.</p> <p>1,* It is a brownfield site.</p> <p>1,* It is closer to most of the town's facilities than the proposed allocation at Rose Hill, including the town centre (0.9 miles), GP surgery (0.9 miles) and secondary school (3.1 miles). It is approximately the same distance from the local primary school (1.6 miles). The site benefits from a wider variety of pedestrian links via more attractive routes away from busy roads, including public rights of way connecting to the town centre via the sea front, encouraging travel by foot.</p> <p>These points are reinforced by the submission from Friends of Brick Dock Neighbours' Group (FOB) to the Issues and Options Version of this Plan in December 2014. Represented by consultancy Quod, FOB submitted a well-argued case for the residential allocation of my clients' site rather than land to the rear of 44-70 Saxmundham Road (see Appendix 2).</p> <p>The site is not assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the Preferred Options consultation documents because it was rejected in the SHLAA, but if the land within the Pit area had been included it would have scored positively or neutrally against most criteria. The accessibility of the site to the town's main facilities suggests that it would be a more sustainable location for development than land at Rose Hill.</p> <p>Accordingly we believe the Pit area should be allocated for residential development instead of land at Rose Hill. Alternatively, if the Council remains minded to allocate land at Rose Hill this site could come forward in addition to make a more significant contribution towards local housing needs and to</p>		

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
		<p>counter the age imbalance identified in the Core Strategy. It could also make a suitable site for a care home. My client would welcome further engagement on the merits of the site as its constraints are analysed in more detail and proposals are worked up.</p> <p>Formal Amendment requested: Add additional Preferred Option site as follows:</p> <p>Preferred Option SSP4 - Land at Crag Pit, Leiston Road, Aldeburgh</p> <p>Land at Crag Pit is identified on the Policies Map for open market housing or a care home. Applicants need to have regard to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1,* No development to exceed two storeys in height</li> <li>1,* Careful consideration be given to the scale and massing of the new buildings to ensure an acceptable impact on the landscape particularly when viewed from the coast</li> <li>1,* A comprehensive landscaping scheme</li> <li>1,* An assessment of the impact of development on the SSSI to secure implementation of a proper management regime alongside increased access and awareness by residents and tourists</li> <li>1,* An assessment of flood risk</li> </ul> <p>Please note that we have not sought to specifically identify the development area as this may need to include some associated land adjacent to the Pit near the road to provide access which will not be known until further studies are undertaken.</p> <p>This site is available, viable and developable now. We would be happy to attend a meeting with you to discuss matters further."</p> <p><i>Formal Amendment requested: Add additional Preferred Option site as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Preferred Option SSP4 - Land at Crag Pit, Leiston Road, Aldeburgh</i></p> <p><i>Land at Crag Pit is identified on the Policies Map for open market housing or a care home. Applicants need to have regard to the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <i>No development to exceed two storeys in height</i></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Careful consideration be given to the scale and massing of the new buildings to ensure an acceptable impact on the landscape particularly when viewed from the coast</i></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <i>A comprehensive landscaping scheme</i></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <i>An assessment of the impact of development on the</i></li> </ul>		

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7201 - Suffolk Preservation Society (Linda Cockburn) [3919]	Support	<p>SSSI to secure implementation of a proper management regime alongside increased access and awareness by residents and tourists</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> An assessment of flood risk</p>	Support noted.	No change.
7016 - Aldeburgh Golf Club [3341]	Support	<p>The revised physical limit boundary is enlarged to include a site to be allocated for a residential care home - we broadly support this approach. Moreover, we are pleased that the Brickworks site currently the subject of an application for 44 houses is not included within the revised physical limits of the town as we feel that this is a tranquil, sensitive site within the AONB which should be protected from development.</p> <p>The amended boundary will facilitate limited residential development in this area by the Golf Club, which in turn will be important in enabling the Golf Club to finance its future aims to upgrade its facilities with the aim that this will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Reinforce and improve its reputation as a centre for golf coaching excellence;</li> <li>* Improve its attractiveness as a destination for the local community;</li> <li>* Enhance its status as a championship course capable of accommodating tournament golf; and in turn</li> <li>* Improve its attractiveness and that of the Town for golf tourism/holiday makers.</li> </ul>	Support noted.	No change.
7423 - Aldeburgh Town Council (Ms Ruth Proctor) [1881]	Support	As Aldeburgh embarks on its final decision making process concerning undertaking a Neighbourhood Plan (following on from the recently completed Town Plan), we are pleased that the town's preference for the development of small inclusive sites of less than 0.25ha, to maintain and enhance a 'balanced, cohesive and socially inclusive community' (Core Strategy SP22), and the 5 listed sites within the Town's physical limits boundary are endorsed.	Support noted.	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

*Aldringham Policy Map*

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7324 - Mr G Ogilvie [3382]	Comment	The reason given for not taking site 3005 forward is that "Aldringham-cum Thorpe will be producing a neighbourhood plan" although the detail and timescale for the production of the plan are not currently set out. As such, the Council have concluded that the 2015 residential requirement for the parish is zero and they would not look to allocate sites at this time. However, the lack of detail and timescale for development of the Neighbourhood Plan indicates that the District have not considered what the housing requirement is in Aldringham.	1.66 ha of land is identified as suitable for approximately 40 dwellings. Site was re-assessed in relation to consistency with other sites under the SA. Included following confirmation from Anglian Water that earlier concerns re waste water treatment no longer apply.	<p>Add policy SSP4 to 'New Housing Allocations':</p> <p>Aldringham is a local service centre situated to the south of Leiston and approximately 0.6 miles west of Knodishall. The settlement follows the B1122 main road between Aldeburgh and Leiston and is also built around the Green on Mill Hill. The Grade 2 listed building 'Parrot and Punchbowl Inn' situated on the crossroads acts as a visual focal point for the village.</p> <p>1.66 ha of land is identified as suitable for approximately 40 dwellings. The site is centrally located, on the eastern side of the village. The land rises gently to the north with Aldringham House located at the north east corner, with the cross roads situated 130 metres to the south.</p> <p>Due to the prominent location of the site; on sloping ground, on the edge of Aldringham, a key consideration is how the development sits in the surrounding landscape. The development should enhance the character of the site and surrounding landscape through high quality design, including planting schemes and boundary treatments. Any loss of native species hedgerow will need to be replaced with additional native species hedging.</p> <p>The design will need to be sympathetic to the setting of nearby listed buildings and, in particular, grade 2 listed building 'Elm Tree Farm House'.</p> <p>Achieving appropriate access arrangements regarding the provision of off road parking, and securing acceptable access sight lines, will be subject to approval by Suffolk County Council Highways Authority.</p> <p>Anglian Water has indicated a requirement to increase the capacity of the surface water network in accordance with the water management hierarchy. This may include the use of soakaways or other forms of sustainable drainage systems. With a site area of over 1ha, a flood risk assessment will also be required.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
			<p>Policy SSP4 - Land to the East of Aldeburgh Road, Aldringham</p> <p>1.66ha of land to the east of Aldeburgh Road, Aldringham, as shown on the Policies Map, is identified for residential use for approximately 40 units.</p> <p>Development will be expected to accord with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Design and layout should enhance the character of the site and surrounding landscape through high quality design, including planting schemes and boundary treatments and be sympathetic to the setting of nearby listed buildings;</li> <li>-Any loss of native species hedgerow will need to be replaced with additional native species hedging;</li> <li>-Provision of affordable housing;</li> <li>-Appropriate access arrangements regarding the provision of off road parking, and securing acceptable access sight lines;</li> <li>-A biodiversity survey will be required and, if necessary, appropriate mitigation provided;</li> <li>-An archaeological assessment will be required;</li> <li>-Provision of a pedestrian crossing point;</li> <li>-Improve the capacity of the surface water network in accordance with the water management hierarchy; and</li> <li>-A flood risk assessment will be required.</li> </ul>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

*Bawdsey Policy Map*

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7397 - Fletcher Barton Ltd (Mr William Barton) [3482]	Comment	<p>We understand that at the time of the core strategy examination in public in 2013, the best available evidence of Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) was 11,000 new homes and this is considered to have increased since then. On page 16 section 2.01 it states that at least 7,900 homes are to be provided, bearing in mind this has now increased by over 3,000, we do not believe enough sites have been allocated to facilitate the level of development needed within the district.</p> <p>Page 21 Table 2 - Updated Housing Contribution 2010-2015 &amp; Proposed New Housing Delivery Allocations does not show any housing allocation for Bawdsey. We would suggest that a minimum of 10 units are allocated to Bawdsey, in line with other local service areas of a similar size. We would suggest that physical limits boundaries should be capable of being amended to include the allocated development.</p> <p>The restriction on development outside physical limits boundaries further highlights the problems identified above regarding shortage of allocated sites. In the example of Bawdsey there are very limited options for development within the existing settlement and it is inevitable that sites beyond the settlement will be identified. As planning policies should be based on the most up to date evidence it is illogical to prevent development outside the current limits when it is inevitable that more land will be needed. Policy SSP2 sets an unnecessary policy obstacle to development that cannot be considered to be positively prepared given the lack of up to date evidence on housing need. The site attached (as outlined in red) is well connected to the village via the B1083 and is abutting an existing settlement boundary. The site attached will provide sensitive and suitable development to Both Bawdsey and the village of Alderton. Either all or part of the site is available for residential development plus landscape features and other village amenities if required.</p> <p>The site attached (as outlined in red) is well connected to the village via the B1083 and is abutting an existing settlement boundary. The site attached</p>	<p>The remit of the SAASP's document, neighbourhood plans and Felixstowe peninsula AAP is to identify land to meet the minimum housing requirement in the adopted Core Strategy. These documents will do this. Updating housing requirements beyond that is a matter for the Local Plan review.</p> <p>Bawdsey has experienced a substantial quantum of development since the start of the plan period as at 31.03.2015. Subsequently additional permissions have been granted. It is not considered appropriate to allocate any additional land for housing. The situation will be reviewed as part of the Local Plan review.</p>	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
		will provide sensitive and suitable development to Both Bawdsey and the village of Alderton. Either all or part of the site is available for residential development plus landscape features and other village amenities if required.		
6845 - Bawdsey Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Webb) [3336]	Object	BCP were surprised by the October 2015 PLB which was particularly at variance with the wishes of BCP as set out in their letters of 15.10.14 and 24.03.15. Sites 401 (SCHLAA document reference number), the wooded area between School Meadow and The Street and School Meadow itself have also been included in the PLB for no stated reason and contrary to the BPC's previously submitted views. This point of view is taken up in many of the letters of objection to the current application to develop School Meadow, in particular a strong objection from Suffolk Preservation Society	The Council when looking at re-drawing the physical limits boundary took the view that the school formed an integral part of the settlement and that East Lane was then an appropriate boundary to take to mark the extent of the physical limits to the settlement. The original suggestion for this site to be allocated for development was dropped. Part of the site is now the subject of a resolution to grant planning permission for 13 units. It is proposed that the remaining area covered by the Tree Preservation Order is now designated and area to be protected from development	Amend paragraph 7.20 to read: These areas are identified on the Policies Map. One new area to be protected from development has been identified at Bawdsey. The site is currently subject to a Tree Preservation Order reflecting its importance to this part of the village.
7205 - Suffolk Preservation Society (Linda Cockburn) [3919]	Object	We strongly object to the proposed extension of the physical limits to include the school and its grounds, and the adjacent land. This is an unsustainable village with few nearby services and inclusion of this open undeveloped land within the physical limits of the village will encourage speculative development. The whole of the village is within the AONB and therefore afforded the highest level of protection. The undeveloped character of this part of the village contributes to the landscape quality the AONB and that extending the physical limit of the village to School Lane has the potential to harm this.	Comments noted. Part of this site is now subject to a resolution to grant planning permission for 13 units. It is recommended that the remaining area which is subject to the Tree Preservation Order is designated an area to be protected from development.	Amend paragraph 7.20 to read: One new area to be protected from development has been identified at Bawdsey. The site is currently subject to a Tree Preservation Order reflecting its importance to this part of the village.
6662 - Mr Robert Gold [3105]	Object	Letter of objection raises issues not just about the inappropriateness of a 13 dwelling estate in the AONB and in a Local Service Centre - but also touches on significant highway safety issues The site should be an area to be protected from development.  <i>The site should be an area to be protected from development</i>	Comments noted. Part of this site is now subject to a resolution to grant planning permission for 13 units. The remaining area is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order and it is proposed that this is now designated an area to be protected from development.	Amend paragraph 7.20 to read:..These areas are identified on the Policies Map. One new area to be protected from development has been identified at Bawdsey. The site is currently subject to a Tree Preservation Order reflecting its importance to this part of the village...."
6573 - Mr Desmond O'Grady [3083]	Support	Supports physical limits boundary as shown	Support noted	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Benhall Policy Map</b>				
6644 - Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council (Dr Hilary Graham) [3427]	Object	We believed that the proposed new physical boundary had been agreed between us, as had the allocation of new housing to be required from Benhall as zero. Both of these agreed policies have been completely ignored and a new physical boundary proposed with further allocations of housing requirements. At no stage have either of these new policies been discussed with the Parish Council.	Comments noted. Both sites were identified as suitable sites in the Issues and Options consultation document at during initial discussions. Policy SSP6 - Land south of Brook Cottage is to be deleted from the plan. Policy SSP5 is retained. Physical limits boundaries are drawn to include allocations. In response to other comments received minor alteration to the physical limits boundary are also proposed around Ella House and land rear of 31 and 33 Benhall Green. Other changes suggested by the Parish Council have been retained.	No change
<b>Blaxhall Policy Map</b>				
7008 - Evolution Town Planning (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [3055]	Comment	These two sites proposed in these representations can provide Blaxhall with the opportunity to expand its supply of housing sustainably, in a planned way over the plan period in a manner that will deliver the types and design of housing appropriate to the area. Allocation of land in Blaxhall is important because the current settlement boundary is drawn tightly, and there are few if any, clear opportunities for windfall infill development over the plan period. There will be few opportunities during the plan period for sustainable rural housing growth, leaving Blaxhall without housing to address issues raised by the community.	<p>It is considered that small scale 'windfall' development is appropriate and sufficient to meet Blaxhall's housing requirement. Therefore, the SAASP document does not propose to allocate housing sites in Blaxhall.</p> <p>Site 3019b lies outside but adjacent to the physical limits. The site scored poorly in a Sustainability Assessment due to relative remoteness from key local services such as shops and secondary education.</p> <p>Site 3019a is poorly related to settlement lying outside the physical limits. The site scored poorly in a Sustainability Assessment due to relative remoteness from key local services such as shops and secondary education.</p>	No change.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<b>Blythburgh Policy Map</b>				
7420 - mr adrian cox [3887]	Comment	<p>There are two areas that are "peculiar". The orange area that is to be protected from development, part of it is used as a scruffy car park and quite unsightly. Why that need protection I don't know, in my view it would be better to do something with it! As for other parts of this orange area, a large chunk is the church and graveyard, the majority of the remainder is on a flood plain where development is not going to be allowed anyway.</p>	<p>Comments noted. However, it is clear from the Conservation Area appraisal that the church and this area of land to the north is important to . Extracts from that document state</p> <p>Key spaces in the conservation area include the churchyard; the green triangle of land at the junction of London Road with Priory Road; and the open fields to the east of Angel Lane, south of Chapel Road and north of the Priory. Also of importance is the marshland setting to the church to its north, which is important for preserving key long views to it. These large green, open spaces are important for preserving the setting of the evolved village alongside its church.</p>	<p>Confirm extension to area to be protected from development on Policies Map. Add small triangle within centre of village as a new area to be protected from development.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7235 - Alex Harrison [3261]	Object	<p>I agree with the broad reiteration against the presumption of any expansion of the village boundary, or any new high density residential development within the village.</p> <p>I note, however, that the current, and proposed, unclear boundary through my land remains, and the Analysis of Responses document makes no mention of the grounds for my suggested rationalisation of the village boundary to accord with the traditional long-standing land ownership boundary. I wish to contest this judgement. While the physical extent of the property boundary</p>	Support noted. With regard to the physical limits boundary around no 2 School Cottages, this has been reconsidered. The plan will be amended to include the garden area as originally provided with the cottage. The cottage and its garden are the last built development of the village at this point. It is different character to the agricultural surrounding agricultural land.	Amend physical limits boundary line for Blythburgh to include the garden of 2 School Cottages as originally provided with the cottage.
7187 - Blythburgh Parish Council (James Boggis) [1978]	Support	Blythburgh Parish Council have reviewed the documentation and have asked that I contact you to inform you of this and to express their support for the changes proposed at Blythburgh.	Support noted.	No change.

**Bredfield Policy Map**

7010 - Evolution Town Planning (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [3055]	Support	Allocation of land in Bredfield is important because the current settlement boundary is drawn tightly and there are few if any clear opportunities for windfall infill development. To address this an allocation should be made in the Site Allocations plan for Bredfield until such time as the neighbourhood plan is ready to take over. This site is in our opinion the best placed to offer the housing needs for the village for the plan period.	Policy SSP1 and Table 2 indicate a minimum number of new homes which individual neighbourhood plan areas will be required to provide. The figure for Bredfield is 10 units. It will be for the neighbourhood plan to determine which is the most appropriate site to accommodate the required new development.	No change
--	---------	--	--	-----------

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Butley Policy Map</b>				
7236 - Butley, Capel St Andrew & Wantisden Parish Council (Ms Joanne Jones) [3684]	Comment	<p>Further to the correspondence received dated 15th October 2015, please find below the response to this consultation from Butley, Wantisden &amp; Capel St Andrew Parish Council:-</p> <p>In respect of the Village Envelope Boundary map the Parish Council would like to recommend strongly that the inclusion of the following areas are included:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Wantisden Corner</li> <li>2) Orford Road (housing)</li> <li>3) Forge Cottage (on corner of Mill Lane)</li> <li>4) Butley Village Hall (area between the Village Hall and Mill Lane)</li> </ol> <p>The Parish Council noted the new housing allocation for Butley was nil and also that site 596 has now been discounted.</p> <p>However, they would like to recommend that this site is the preferred site if any future development was to be granted in order to fulfil the outcome of the Housing Needs Survey carried out in June 2008.</p> <p>I trust that you will take the above comments into consideration.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council noted the new housing allocation for Butley was nil and also that site 596 has now been discounted. However, they would like to recommend that this site is the preferred site if any future development was to be granted in order to fulfil the outcome of the Housing Needs Survey carried out in June 2008.</i></p>	<p>Allocating this site could result in an inappropriate quantum of housing in a small local service centre. The spatial relationship of the site to the existing housing would result in a development out of character with the characteristic arrangement of Butley's existing housing.</p> <p>The site scored poorly in a Sustainability Appraisal -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To improve the health of the population overall</li> <li>14. To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment</li> <li>22. To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</li> </ol>	No change.
7076 - Evolution Town Planning (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [3055]	Comment	<p>Draft Policy SSP2</p> <p>6.11 Draft policy SSP2 concerns the proposed physical limits boundaries.</p> <p>6.12 The physical limits boundary for Butley is proposed to be amended bringing it into a closer relationship with this site.</p> <p>6.13 Should site 596 be reassessed at this stage or any later stage and find itself warranting an allocation then we consider the revised physical limit for Butley should be increased to encompass it.</p>	<p>Allocating this site could result in an inappropriate quantum of housing in a small settlement. The spatial relationship of the site to the existing housing would result in a development out of character with the characteristic arrangement of Butley's existing housing.</p>	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7074 - Evolution Town Planning (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [3055]	Comment	<p>This site is located to the southeast of Butley, adjoining the settlement boundary, and is accessed via an existing access off Short Walk and Church Road. The access is wide, the site owner has control over the visibility splays, and there is good visibility in either direction. There are no planning or environmental designations preventing development and it is outside of the Environment Agency flood zones 2 and 3, so is not at risk of flooding.</p> <p>The site is vacant and immediately available for development and a supportive Parish Council willing to engage positively in the development of this site.</p>	<p>Allocating this site could result in an inappropriate quantum of housing in a small local service centre. The spatial relationship of the site to the existing development pattern could result in a development out of character with the characteristic arrangement of Butley's existing housing.</p>	No change.
<b>Chillesford Policy Map</b>				
7204 - Suffolk Preservation Society (Linda Cockburn) [3919]	Comment	<p>the site is not shown as a preferred option allocated site and the village is wholly within the AONB. The Society feels strongly that the inclusion of a site within the SHLAA should not be used as the basis for increasing the physical limits of a local service centre particularly one within the AONB. Moreover we consider that the potential to limit development of this site to affordable housing only would be greater if the site remains outside the physical limits of the village and so is delivered as an 'exception' site.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The site is of insufficient size to be considered for allocation, but is considered to have merits as a potential future housing site. It is well related to the existing built form of the village and whilst being within the AONB should not be ruled out solely on that basis albeit it would be a consideration should a scheme come forward. The Council agrees that if this site is to be promoted for affordable housing, that it is removed from the physical limits boundary.</p>	Amend policies map for Chillesford to delete site 773a from the physical limits boundary
7269 - Chillesford Parish Council (Mr Peter McGinity) [3381]	Support	<p>We note the comments on the adverse aspects of development of site 773a in terms of sustainability but point to the fact that the same comments would apply to any existing properties in the village. Despite this, the village is a thriving local community with a broad demographic make up including a sizeable population of children. The comments from Anglia Water are noted if somewhat opaque but the drainage problem is one shared by most of the village. The parish also recommended that site 773a be used for affordable housing, a view shared by the landowner.</p>	<p>The inclusion of site 773a has been re-considered. Where land is required purely for affordable housing, it is considered that this is more appropriately brought forward under the existing exceptions site policy DM1. On that basis the site is to be removed from the physical limits boundary.</p>	Amend the policies map for Chillesford to delete site 773a from the physical limits boundary.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

*Darsham Policy Map*

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7457 - Darsham Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Cardwell) [3507]	Comment	The Parish Council would like to take up Hilary Hanslip's suggestion (made to our chairman on the 11th November) that a separate policy attaches to this site stipulating that development can only proceed in a manner exactly as or similar to the present-planning application and which -therefore brings the same benefits to Darsham. If making such a policy proves to be impractical, then the Parish Council wishes the PLB to be drawn from Chapel Cottages along the street to the present village hall, leaving the site in question outside the envelope.	Comment noted. A new policy and supporting text is now included within the plan	<p>Add new policy SSP7 and supporting text to 'Housing Allocations' to read:</p> <p>NEW POLICY SSP7 Land to the rear of 1 and 2 Chapel Cottages adjoining The Street, Darsham</p> <p>INSERT MAP</p> <p>Darsham is a Key Service Centre with extant planning permission for some 42 new dwellings as at 31/03/2015, the base date for this plan, to be provided over three sites as shown on the inset map. Whilst the other two sites are permitted solely for housing (a mix of open market and affordable), land to the rear of 1 and 2 Chapel Cottages has outline planning permission (DC/13/2933/OUT) for a mixed use development which will secure the provision a new village hall, village green and 20 homes of which 6 are affordable. The accompanying design and access statement states that the proposal seeks to link two parts of the village and at the same time create a new focal point for the village, arranged around a village green and a new village hall. The outline application is supported by a number of illustrative plans and layout. Drawing no. 1236 Rev B dated 22/10/2013 details the design for the new village hall which is expected to provide both large and small function rooms, store room, plant room, kitchen and toilets. This plan is important in that it provides details as to the minimum size of function room(s) identified to meet community needs. The highway authority have however confirmed by way of an informative attached to the decision notice that the layout for the parking area as shown on the indicative plans is not acceptable. A detailed scheme will be required to address this point. Housing types provide for a mix units both in terms of size and design reflecting the variety of the existing housing stock in the area which is encouraged.</p> <p>Work has yet to commence on site. Therefore in order to provide additional policy support to secure the additional community benefits of the village green and replacement village hall, the following policy will apply. The criteria identified reflect</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>matters identified as informatics or specific planning conditions attached to planning permission DC/13/2933/OUT.</p> <p>The decision notice includes a comprehensive set of conditions designed to address issues of concern, which are reflected in the criteria attached to the policy.</p> <p>Policy SSP7 land to the rear of 1 and 2 Chapel Cottages, The Street, Darsham</p> <p>1.86ha of land is identified at The Street, Darsham as shown on the Policies Maps for a mixed use development comprising a village hall, village green, and 20 new homes in accordance with outline planning permission DC/13/2933/OUT.</p> <p>Development will be expected to accord with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* On-site archaeological investigation across the whole site;</li> <li>* The need for a contaminated land assessment;</li> <li>* Provision for the storage of refuse/recycling bins</li> <li>* A new village hall to provide as a minimum the accommodation shown in drawing no. 1236 Darsham Village Rev B dated 22/10/2013 including associated parking;</li> <li>* A landscaping scheme which provides for the retention of existing trees and hedgerows to the site boundaries except where removal is necessary to provide for access into the site;</li> <li>* Provision of a surface water drainage scheme which accords with the surface water management hierarchy;</li> <li>* Affordable housing;</li> <li>* A single point of vehicular access only to serve the development; and</li> <li>* Completion of an ecological survey to identify the presence or otherwise of any protected species.</li> </ul>	

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7027 - Mr Mark Haslam [2865]	Support	<p>SITE 378a -North side of Darsham Street</p> <p>The field area between the earlier defined physical limits boundary, and 1 to 8 The Street, has always been recognised as Darsham's most suitable, and preferred site to provide future housing for the village. Part of the field is currently being developed, - 13 dwellings, making a meaningful contribution towards meeting your Council's new housing stock requirements.</p> <p>Recently, on 10th November, the Parish Council discussed your Council's proposal documents I plans, and they remain fully in support and in favour of this site providing for future housing. If they have not already done so, we understand they will be writing to you expressing this view.</p> <p>Sizewell C is now very much back on the agenda, for which Darsham may provide a Park and Ride Centre. This, together with demand and Housing requirements in the District, may bring about circumstances where additional housing is more urgently needed than it is now. Having a road frontage of circa 157 metres, and average depth of 73 metres, the site is of ideal proportions, - for either complete, or a phased development, being readily available to deliver housing, - in the immediate, short, or medium to longer term.</p> <p>The proposed revised physical limits boundary, as is shown in your Council's document, includes site 378a, and further extends to include those existing properties 1 to 8 The Street. This re-alignment I proposed enclosure represents an all inclusive village centre, identifying and making appropriate provision for future housing.</p> <p>Having studied your Council's Sustainability Assessment for the site, the land owners are pleased to see all of the positives which this carries, although there is reference to, - anecdotal evidence, suggesting the road and ditch is liable to flooding. This has happened in the past, being due to a lack of maintenance in another part of the village, a problem that has long since been resolved. There is no such flooding issue.</p> <p>To conclude, we trust your Council will maintain re-alignment of the physical limits boundary as is proposed, and Mr &amp; Mrs Bloomfield are able to deliver this site in any time scale that your Council may</p>	<p>Darsham has experienced a substantial quantum of development since the start of the plan period with 45 extant permissions as at 31.03.2015. Subsequently, additional permissions have been granted. It is not considered appropriate to allocate any additional land for housing. The situation will be reviewed as part of the Local Plan review.</p>	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<hr/>				
require.				
<i>Dennington Policy Map</i>				
7203 - Suffolk Preservation Society (Linda Cockburn) [3919]	Comment	we are pleased that revision to the physical limits boundary will remove the southern section of the conservation area - namely the grounds of the Old Rectory, the playing field and the church - outside the built up area boundary. Furthermore the Society is in support of all other instances where a place of worship has been taken out of the proposed revised physical limits of settlements as part of this review.	Support noted.	No change
7202 - Suffolk Preservation Society (Linda Cockburn) [3919]	Support	we are pleased that revision to the physical limits boundary will remove the southern section of the conservation area - namely the grounds of the Old Rectory, the playing field and the church - outside the built up area boundary. Furthermore the Society is in support of all other instances where a place of worship has been taken out of the proposed revised physical limits of settlements as part of this review.	Support noted	No change
<i>Earl Soham Policy Map</i>				
6685 - Earl Soham Parish Council (Ms Jane Page) [3553]	Support	Earl Soham Parish Council have no further comments to add to the Consultation and agree with the site allocations/physical limits as shown for their parish	Comments noted.	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Easton Policy Map</i>				
6848 - Carolyn Godfrey-Hollins [3437]	Object	<p>Site 672a Land Adjacent to Easton Primary School, Easton</p> <p>In addition to my previous letter on the first public consultation, which I still strongly uphold my views on the above sites inclusion in the SHLAA document. With regard to the comment that there is 'no sign of negative effect identified' regarding the sites sustainability, I strongly disagree for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Easton has no public transport system. The number of traffic movements within the village would be dramatically increased if this site was agreed and developed.</li> <li>2. There are poor infrastructures within the village. Firstly, the foul sewage system is under extreme pressure, already resulting in overflowing of sewage into gardens along the drainage route when heavy rain is experienced. The pressure on this system has been highlighted by Anglia Water in their feedback on this consultation. Broadband in the village is often inadequate and there is no fiberoptics.</li> <li>3. Use of this greenfield land would be wholly inappropriate and would cause irreversible harm to the adjacent heritage assets and the gateway to this historic village.</li> <li>4. It cannot be ignored that although the site itself will not flood due to its elevation, the site drains down into the flood meadows which already flood into existing properties gardens.</li> </ol> <p>I hope that these comments will be given serious consideration.</p>	<p>The site in question SHLAA 2014 Easton 672a is currently at appeal (APP/054/2015) regarding the refusal of DC/14/2244. The SAASP document will be adapted to reflect the outcome of the appeal process.</p>	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7692 - Mr Bryan Howard [1203]	Object	I came into your offices earlier this year regarding the Core Strategy plan, where my proposed building application was listed as number 530, to find that not only had my boundary still not been returned to its rightful place, but it was now changed, cutting off all my garden and almost passing my back door. I had no prior knowledge of this being proposed either by word of mouth or in writing, and I find the whole business vindictive and discriminating. It appears there is a definite obstructive attitude over these issues which appears to be both devious and upsetting.	This section of the physical limits boundary for Easton has been reconsidered. After further consideration of the points raised and based on the established physical limits and other points of reference, the physical limits have been amended to continue the alignment of the rear wall of the adjacent property The Cockpit to where it meets the church.	Amend the Policies Map for Easton to continue the alignment of the rear wall of the adjacent property The Cockpit to where it meets the church.
7100 - Jill Temperton [3325]	Support	I fully support about the exclusion of SHLAA Site 672a. Easton Site 672a is outside the Physical Limits Boundary of the village. It is within the River Deben Special Landscape Area and is protected from inappropriate development by both Saved Policy AP13 and current Policy SP15. The landscape character of the site is Rolling Estate Claylands. This is linear development along the river valley in the case of Easton village. It is therefore contrary to Policy DM21. The site adjoins the Easton Conservation Area and would adversely affect its the setting. It is also within the setting of Listed Buildings.	The site in question SHLAA 2014 Easton 672a is currently at appeal (APP/054/2015) regarding the refusal of DC/14/2244. The SAASP document will be adapted to reflect the outcome of the appeal process.	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7116 - Hopkins Homes [551]	Support	<p>The Plan also fails to allocate any sites to accommodate growth at the Local Service Centre of Easton. Hopkins Homes (Hopkins &amp; Moore) has an interest in land adjacent to Easton Primary School as shown on the plan below. The site comprises the only suitable site in the village the 2014 SHLAA (Site 627a) for the delivery of 20 homes.</p> <p>The site has been subject to two previous planning applications, initially for 17 homes (DC/13/3766/FUL) which was withdrawn in April 2014 and subsequently a revised scheme for 14 homes (DC/14/2244/FUL) which was recommended favourably by Officers on the basis that it represented sustainable development. Notwithstanding this, the application was refused at Committee in February 2015 and is now subject to an appeal. As a result of this decision the site has, seemingly without justification, been removed from the Site Allocations Document despite the fact that Appendix 3 of the document clearly states that no significant negative effects were identified. There are considered to be no constraints to development on the site which represents a sustainable and deliverable option to accommodate further growth in Easton.</p> <p>A policy should be added to the Plan to allocate the site for at least 14 dwellings.</p>	<p>The site in question SHLAA 2014 Easton 672a is currently at appeal (APP/054/2015) regarding the refusal of DC/14/2244. The SAASP document will be adapted to reflect the outcome of the appeal process.</p>	No change.
<b>Grundisburgh Policy Map</b>				
6675 - Grundisburgh & Culpho Parish Council (Mr John Ager) [2446]	Object	<p>The land fronting Ipswich Road and Park Road adjacent to the playing field has been included in the proposed physical limits boundary. This would consolidate the ribbon development along this narrow road. It is the open aspect and number of trees in this area that makes a gentle buffer between the countryside and the built up area of the village. As planning applications received within the Physical Limits carry a presumption in favour of approval and as Grundisburgh has already exceeded the allocation contained in these documents Grundisburgh Parish Council considers it unreasonable to extend the physical limits boundaries.</p>	<p>This area has been re-considered and on reflection would appear to be of similar character to that in Chapel Road/Chapel Lane which is outside of the physical limits boundary. It is proposed that the boundary be re-drawn to reflect that on the 2001 Proposals Map for this locality</p>	<p>Amend Policies Map for Grundisburgh for Ipswich Road/Park Road to retain the line as shown on the 2001 Proposals Map</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b>Hacheston Policy Map</b>				
7209 - Hacheston Parish Council (Mr Bartholomew Hall) [3513]	Comment	Traffic is of great concern to both Hacheston Parish Council and residents. Current traffic issues in Hacheston are exacerbated by the length, gradient, straightness and narrowness of the B1116 through the village, the narrowness of the footpath and the volume of agricultural and HGVs using the road. These issues can only become more acute with development in Framlingham. The development of 475 dwellings in Framlingham implies approximately 950 vehicles. Many will no doubt work in Ipswich, Woodbridge and Martlesham. New residents would also use the A1120 from Framlingham, so perhaps half of new journeys would take place along the B1116.	As part of the determination process for 95 dwellings DC/15/2759/FUL and 163 dwellings DC/14/2747/FUL, cumulative traffic impacts were looked at. Transport Assessments were submitted in support of both applications and Suffolk Local Highways Authority raised no objections.	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7108 - Mr Martin Price [3128]	Support	<p>I act for the owners of the above-mentioned sites. Having read the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Preferred Options Consultation Document, my clients believe that the Local Planning Authority has overlooked two good sites adjacent to the defined physical limits of the settlement, and that those sites should be allocated for development.</p> <p>Hacheston is classified as a Local Service Centre in the adopted Settlement Hierarchy and Policy SP27 advises that new housing in the form of small allocations of a scale appropriate to the site, location and characteristics of the particular community will be permitted where there is proven local support. There is a proven shortage of housing across the whole of the Suffolk Coastal District. The Council states that it can demonstrate 5.12 years supply of available housing land. Irrespective of whether this is in fact the case, the Council needs to make provision for approximately 11,000 new homes across the District between 2010 and 2027. Key and Local Service Centres such as Hacheston should contribute to the identified need. Both sites lie within the designated Special Landscape Area, as does the existing settlement. Its SLA designation does not preclude new development as a matter of principle.</p> <p>Site A encompasses an area of approximately 0.56ha of agricultural land.</p> <p>Site B encompasses an area of approximately 0.44ha of agricultural land.</p> <p>It is concluded that both sites could accommodate 5 dwellings in a form that reflects the pattern of development (frontage) along The Street. The low density would be appropriate on the edge of the settlement where densities would be expected to be less than within the centre of the settlement.</p> <p>It is concluded that both sites can be developed</p>	<p>Agree. 0.56 ha of land south of Solomon's Rest, The Street, is identified as suitable for small scale housing development for approximately 10 dwellings.</p>	Policy SSP9 added to 'New Housing Allocations'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>without any material adverse impact on:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Landscape character of the SLA;</li> <li>* Pattern and character of development with this part of the settlement;</li> <li>* Access and highway safety;</li> <li>* Flood risk;</li> <li>* Biodiversity; or</li> <li>* Residential amenity.</li> </ul> <p>The sites the subject of this representation are suitable for development, available and deliverable. Development here would accord with the NPPF three dimensions of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) and should therefore be considered for allocation.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b>Hollesley Policy Map</b>				
7426 - Mortiers (Mr James Leggett) [3968]	Comment	It was suggested that I put my plan in and you will no doubt judge it on its merits and take a view. I am available anytime to discuss the finer detail if required.	Since the start of the plan period, Hollesley has received a substantial quantum of development 60 dwellings as at 31.03.2015. As such, the SAASP document will not allocate sites for additional housing. The situation will be reviewed as part of the Local Plan review. As part of the consultation process, the following sites were sent to Suffolk Local Highways Authority. Your ref A (Site 3464), your ref B (site 3465) and your ref C (3466). Each site had access issues identified. The following comments were received: 3464: Access from Heath Road possible by would involve a great deal of hedge removal as the grass verge is not very wide here, although the hedge looks to be on highway land. Heath Road is fairly narrow and would require some localised widening. Footway at the back of a wide verge on opposite side of the road, links to other village facilities. Close to the end of the 30 mph speed limit, and this would need to be extended. 3465: The unmade section of Stebbings Lane is not adopted, this would need to be resolved, although road looks to be too narrow to serve a substantial development. The rest of Tower Hill / Stebbings Lane is also fairly narrow, with some scope to widen in parts. Does not look suitable at the present time. 3466: The junction of Bushey Lane and Alderton road is poor, with little visibility. Alderton Road and Bushey Lane have no footway, so poor sustainable links to the rest of the village. Bushey Lane is very narrow and probably not suitable for further significant development without improvement.	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6852 - Julie Williams [2126]	Comment	<p>I would like to re-submit Site 463. The site was excluded upon recommendation from the Highways Authority; access to site 463 could be to the South of the existing dwelling, the bungalow could be demolished for access or the plot could possibly be accessed from the proposed development at site 772a (772b).</p> <p>Any planning permission could be conditional on meeting certain requirements.</p> <p>In the interests of fairness, transparency and integrity I respectfully request that Site 463 be included in the Specific Site Allocations at this time.</p>	<p>Site 463 (3463) was resubmitted to Suffolk Local Highways Authority for consideration&gt; The following comments were received: 'Access to Rectory road looks to have poor visibility, Rectory Road narrow single track road' and 'Access onto Rectory Road not acceptable'.</p>	No change.
6802 - Mr David Wood [3805]	Object	Objects to suggested physical limits boundary on the grounds that it will bring no benefit to neighbours or the local community; inadequate roads and might unwittingly facilitate inappropriate development.	Comments noted. The suggested second physical limits boundary for Hollesley has now been reconsidered and is to be deleted from the plan	Amend policies map for Hollesley to delete the physical limits boundary for the Alderton Road/Bushey Lane area.
6954 - Mr Roger Underhill [3865]	Object	I would like to register my objection to any boundary changes to Hollesley village, as I can see no logical or practical reason for doing so, unless you have an agenda that I am unaware of.	Comment noted. The suggested second physical limits boundary has now been reconsidered. It is to be deleted.	Amend policies map for Hollesley to remove physical limits boundary from the Alderton Road/Bushey Lane area.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6621 - Hollesley Parish Council (Mrs Judi Hallett) [3686] 6669 - Mrs Beverley Gibson [3753] 6670 - Mr Paul Gibson [3744] 6676 - Mr P & Mrs A Norton [3755] 6793 - Mr & Mrs J A Wright [3800] 6850 - Ann Smith [3827] 6874 - A & S Palmer [3837] 6991 - G James/ J Harrup [3876] 7048 - Liberal Democrat Members (Cllr Christine Block) [3375] 7099 - Mr Martin Benatar [3896] 7206 - Suffolk Preservation Society (Linda Cockburn) [3919] 7294 - Mr Robin Smith [3947] 7295 - Mrs Mary Smith [3948] 7323 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [2605] 7454 - Rex Allum [3985] 7461 - Mr & Mrs Halliwell [3990] 7462 - Mr Michael Hurley [3991] 7464 - G S Jones [3993] 7470 - Dr & Mrs H & S Lyons [3996] 7471 - Martin and Sue Miller [3997] 7472 - J & P Maskell [3998] 7473 - Mr & Mrs D Mitcham [3999] 7483 - Mrs Anne Palmer [4007] 7485 - Mr Jonathan Pratt [4008] 7489 - J & C Skinmore [4013] 7490 - Mr & Mrs Syrett [4014] 7495 - Raymond Watson [4017]	Object	Object to suggested new physical limits boundary for the Alderton Road/ Bushey Lane area of Hollesley for a variety of reasons but particularly the fact that it would allow for significant levels of new development.	This area was originally considered for inclusion within a physical limits boundary given the scale of existing residential development. This has been reconsidered and is now proposed for deletion given the potential impact on character of this part of Hollesley.	Amend policies map for Hollesley to delete physical limits boundary around Alderton Road / Bushey Lane

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7456 - Mr A J Catchpole [3986]	Support	<p>think the three reasons the Parish Council opposed this proposal were weak and misleading. There are areas being developed further away from the centre of the village near the water tower for example. Alderton Road (C341) is much wider than Bushey Lane.</p> <p>I have walked this area for 66 years with no problems. I have identified only six building plots in the area on the enclosed map; all would be described as infilling three plots on each road. Any extra traffic would be insignificant. I see no reason why Suffolk Coastal District Council proposals should not be adopted.</p>	Support noted. However following reconsideration of this proposal in response to comments received, the suggested second physical limits boundary is to be deleted.	No change
<b>Kelsale Policy Map</b>				
7177 - Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council (Mrs Joanne Jones) [2838]	Support	The Parish Council were pleased to see that the village envelope boundary had been amended to include the suggestions as stated within letter dated 19th February 2015.	Support noted.	No change.
<b>Knodishall Policy Map</b>				
7332 - Mr G Ogilvie [3382]	Comment	<p>It is our contention that if the Council have properly assessed the reasonable alternatives as required by the EU Directive, the Regulations and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), that site reference 3009 would perform the same as the preferred site and may even perform better and its allocation would contribute to the Council's requirements to meet objectively assessed needs for housing.</p> <p>We contend that the Council needs to go through the sustainability appraisal process, assess whether site reference 3009 meets sustainable development criteria and potentially allocate if it meets or exceeds the current Preferred Option Site.</p>	All sites submitted to the Council as part of the consultation process will be subject to Sustainability Appraisal. The results of these appraisals are one element of the site allocation decision making process. The results of the Sustainability Appraisals will be published alongside the Publication Version of the Site Allocations DPD. However, initial comments received from Suffolk County Highways have raised concerns about the suitability of this site on the basis of the poor access.	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

*Middleton Policy Map*

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7421 - Mrs R Pateman [3146]	Object	<p>I have today received a reply to the question I raised regarding the negative response to my request for land at Mill Street to be included in the physical limits extension proposal, which I would add has taken over 4 weeks for you to reply to, despite bringing this matter up with Cllr.Tony Cooper at the November Parish Council meeting, when he too took my name and address.</p> <p>This consultation drop-in was a complete waste of time. The plan of Middleton was/is not up to date and the staff present were unable to answer the question that your report raised regarding sustainability negativity, and I was certainly not alone in leaving this drop-in session with the same feeling.</p> <p>I am completely amazed and astounded at your reply regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Distance of health care.</li> <li>2 Distance of schools.</li> <li>3 Distance of convenience store - again your facts are out of date, the Westleton shop changed it's name 2 years ago.</li> <li>4 Recent Planning History - the land opposite RECEIVED planning permission for 7 properties, 4 of which are already to roof height. Again your reply is not up to date.</li> </ul> <p>How can you in all good sense state the above as negatives to 3010 when there are 7 properties being built directly opposite the land in question, 2 more in the village have just been given permission and it is possible that a further 2 market value and 4 affordables, which incidentally is what this village needs, not more holiday/second homes of 3/4 bedroom size, must surely have/had the very same negative arguments against them ?- how can you justify the answer you have given to my request when clearly you have chosen not to apply it to those properties now under way.? I would also add that 8 of the properties that have planning permission are currently 'out' of the physical limit, and your planning department obviously didn't take too much notice of what was to be built in Mill Street as the 4 properties on the roadside are so dreadfully tall and have caused much negative comment from villagers that this part of the development has completely spoilt this particular approach to our village, such a dreadful mistake as</p>	<p>The submission raises a number of issues. Detailed issues have been addressed separately in correspondence with the objector. The house and the garden are now included within the physical limits.</p>	<p>Physical limits boundary has been amended to include Mill House and the whole garden.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>they are built on elevated ground and are just on the roadside.</p> <p>The purpose of bringing the land in question into the physical limit was to, at some point in the future, allow myself to downsize into a bungalow as it would be my desire to stay in the village I have lived in and made friends in for over 27 years.</p> <p>I am not alone when I say I have serious concerns about how SCDC Planning &amp; the Physical Limits departments operate, it doesn't leave one with a good feeling about what is happening in our council and how it happens.</p> <p>May I suggest that when you have a consultation drop in in the future you make sure your representatives are equipped to at least try and answer questions rather than take a name and address with a promise to reply within a few days, not leave it over 4 weeks, and that your District Councillor is also fully versed and given an up to date plan when attending a Parish Council Meeting when he knows from the Agenda that questions are likely to come up on planning as was most certainly the case at the November meeting with other disgruntled villagers present regarding planning.</p> <p>How can you in all good sense state the negatives to 3010 when there are 7 properties being built directly opposite the land in question, 2 more in the village have just been given permission and it is possible that a further 2 market value and 4 affordables, which incidentally is what this village needs, not more holiday/second homes of 3/4 bedroom size, must surely have/had the very same negative arguments against them? I would also add that 8 of the properties that have planning permission are currently 'out' of the physical limit</p>		

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Nacton Policy Map</b>				
7267 - Strutt and Parker (Melissa Reynolds) [3938]	Comment	<p>It is proposed that this site could be included in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies as a development opportunity for housing requirements or providing economic development, leisure or community opportunities as it is in a sustainable location, close to a major centre, and easily accessible in terms of transport connections. The site should also be removed from the AONB, to which it provides very limited positive contribution due to its separation by the A14.</p> <p>The Core Strategy identifies Nacton as a Local Service Centre level, which is one of the most sustainable locations for development.</p>	No change.	No change.
<b>Newbourne Policy Map</b>				
6960 - Mr Tony Finch [3869]	Object	<p>There has been no growth in our village for 30 years apart from agricultural restricted dwellings.</p> <p>The infrastructure can accommodate some extra dwellings and needs them to aid the sustainability of our village.</p> <p>We are condemned to stagnate .</p> <p>Why is Bawdsey a Local Service Centre and not Newbourne?</p> <p><i>Place Newbourne in the correct level of your Hierarchy and stop the discrimination which is being shown</i></p>	<p>It is not appropriate to re consider the settlement hierarchy through this Local Plan document, which seeks to deliver the strategic policies in the adopted Core Strategy. The settlement hierarchy will be reconsidered as part of the early review of the Core Strategy.</p>	No change

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<i>Peasenhall Policy Map</i>				
<p>6551 - Mr John Bawtree [3399]  6575 - Mr John Bawtree [3399]  7432 - Corrina Giles [3969]  7433 - Justin Neale [3970]  7434 - Kim Nessling [3971]  7435 - Rhian Norman [3972]  7436 - O Platt &amp; L Mobbs [3973]  7437 - Janet Tagg [3442]  7438 - Mr Martyn Burnside [3361]  7439 - Mr Alan Robinson [3974]  7440 - Rachel &amp; Richard Turner [3282]  7441 - Genevieve Broad [3975]  7442 - M C Walker [3976]  7443 - H Russell [3977]  7444 - Mr John Bawtree [3399]  7445 - Mr Christopher Bishop [3445]  7446 - Barbara Jockel [3978]  7447 - Jan Farmery [3979]  7448 - Lynn Emerson [3980]  7449 - F M Burley [3981]  7450 - Mrs Julia Etteridge [3982]  7451 - Ms Rosemary Steward [594]  7452 - Dorte Simpson [3983]  7453 - Ann Wickins [3984]  7467 - Mr Kenneth Parry Brown [3202]  7469 - Mr Kenneth Parry Brown [3202]  7480 - Peasenhall C.P School (Fin Barker) [4004]  7481 - Peasenhall C.P School (Seth .) [4006]  7482 - Peasenhall C.P School (Mason Cole) [4005]  7494 - Mrs V J Parry Brown [3446]</p>	Object	<p>Objections to the inclusion of site 475 within the physical limits boundary for a variety of reasons including difficulties of access across the causeway; loss of allotments; that if allowed the owners would then look for substantially more homes than the five suggested and would also look to develop the land to the rear; loss of hedgerow; loss of views through to the green hillside to the south; new homes if taken up as second homes or holiday lets would not contribute to village life.</p> <p>Support for this site to be allocated as a village park/amenity area possible skate park/ play area / village orchard.</p>	<p>The responses provide a clear message that the site should be removed from the physical limits boundary or it should be allocated as a park/amenity area for the village. In addition to the comments noted, the site is also identified as an important open space within the centre of the village in the Conservation Area Appraisal. It notes "The heart of Peasenhall is The Street, characterised by rows of largely unspoilt traditional buildings, facing each other across an unusually wide open space, much of which is taken up by the central grassed area with mature trees and a stream, crossed by footbridges.</p>	<p>Amend the physical limits boundary for Peasenhall to exclude site 475.</p>

*Remove site from the physical limits boundary.*

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7164 - Mr Martyn Burnside [3361]	Support	<p>We have recently received information from SCC Highways which contradict the previous assumption that this site unsuitable for housing development &amp; suggests that up to 4 dwellings could be built on the site. We have attached an e-mail confirm this.</p> <p>We would like to propose that a reduced site 739 is included within the revised physical limits for Peasenhall.</p> <p>Considering this positive traffic study and other positive benefits that were sent to you in the previous consultation period, it is considered that site 739 should be included within the revised physical limits for the Peasenhall village envelop.</p>	Comments noted. The reduced site area is of insufficient size to be allocated in the plan. The site will be included within the physical limits boundary	Amend physical limits boundary for Peasenhall to include site 739 (reduced area)
6667 - Peasenhall Parish Council (Mr Chris Norrington) [3751]	Support	<p>After hearing from residents, the parish council agreed to make the following comments on the plan:-</p> <p>There was wholehearted support for the changes in the vicinity of the village hall. In relation to the proposed changes in the boundary on the Causeway, the vote was equally split with the Chairman using his casting vote in favour of the proposed change.</p> <p>Support was given for a modest development of up to 6 units on site 739 to include open space and parking for residents of Oak View.</p>	Comments noted. Support for changes to the physical limits boundary around the village hall are noted. Site 739 has now been reduced in size to a point where original highway objections can be overcome. The reduced area is of insufficient size to be allocated in the plan but will now be incorporated within a revised physical limits boundary. Site 475 see full response against other comments. This site will now be removed from the physical limits boundary. The opportunity still exists for the Parish Council and the local community to investigate the possible use of this site as an amenity area. Excluding the site from the physical limits boundary is not considered to be a barrier to this.	Amend policies map for Peasenhall to (1) exclude site 475 from the physical limits boundary; and (2) include site 739 (reduced area).
<b>Rendham Policy Map</b>				
7455 - Rendham Parish Council (Mrs C Salmon) [3430]	Comment	<p>Why inclusion of entire of garden area to the rear of East View as on previous maps?</p> <p>* Please see enclosed map showing what we believe to be the correct line highlighted in blue. Some of these long gardens I understand were purchased from the farmer and were agricultural land. other areas correct.</p>	Comment noted. The area in question has been reconsidered and is now excluded from the physical limits boundary	Amend physical limits boundary for Rendham at East View to retain 2001 boundary alignment.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
<b>Rushmere St Andrew &amp; Kesgrave Policy Map</b>				
7256 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd [2719]	Comment	<p>We propose the allocation of land to the east of Bell Lane, Kesgrave for housing development, in order to help meet the delivery of housing levels as set out within the adopted Core Strategy. The site is 15ha in area and of a sufficient size to accommodate 300 dwellings.</p> <p>A planning application for the proposed development of the site has been submitted for the phased development of 300 dwellings, provision of land for primary school and associated landscaping and open space. The homes can therefore come forward promptly and contribute to the housing supply within the District.</p>	<p>This site is currently the subject of a planning application (DC/15/4672/OUT). The plan will reflect the outcome of the application as appropriate</p>	No change
6999 - Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council (Mr Mel Bentley) [502]	Comment	<p>Appendix 6 Policy Maps, Pages 217.- The Sandlings and Mill Stream areas are officially designated as Local Nature Reserves and as such we believe they should be shown on the map as 'Areas to be Protected from Development' or 'Special Landscape Areas'. We would also like to query whether Rushmere Heath should also be treated as an Area to be Protected from Development and shaded appropriately.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The land in question is already protected being a local nature reserve. At preferred option stage the physical limits boundary was redrawn in this locality to exclude it from the physical limits boundary.</p>	No change
7239 - Grainger PLC [585]	Comment	<p>We would advocate that a more realistic delivery rate for Adastral Park during the Plan Period would be in the region of 900 to 1000 dwellings, highlighting the continued needs within the IPA for the Council to identify additional land to meet the minimum requirement of 2,320 dwellings.</p> <p>Given the need to deliver this quantum of housing within a defined geographical area, the options available to the Council is limited. There are however options available to the south of Kesgrave, which can come forward in a timely manner, and which would offset the deficit in completions expected to occur.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Latest information from BT indicates that the level of provision through the plan period will be 1,575 units, a reduction of 175 units from that shown in the Preferred Options. The reference to sites south of Kesgrave relate to a current planning application for 300 units at Bell Lane. The plan will reflect the outcome of this application as appropriate.</p>	Update Table 2 and policy SSP1 to reflect latest figures from BT 1,575 units through the plan period
7479 - Mr Alistair Livingstone [3494]	Comment	<p>I've emailed you a couple of times about the consultation to do with the changes to the Development Boundary as we'd like to apply for it to moved to the edge of our garden as it currently dissects it.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This physical limits boundary has been reconsidered in relation to this property. The boundary will be changed to incorporate the whole garden.</p>	Amend physical limit boundary for Rushmere to include full garden area

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Rushmere St Andrew Village Policy Map</b>				
7000 - Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council (Mr Mel Bentley) [502]	Comment	Appendix 6 Policy Maps, Pages 218. - We note that the PLB has been moved outwards to encompass the land adjacent to 155 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew. Presumably this is in the light of a recent successful Appeal to the Planning Inspectorate by the developer. We query whether this is a premature move of the PLB as a Legal Challenge is still outstanding on the land in question.	The physical limits boundary was changed following receipt of the appeal decision. The result of the legal challenge has also now been received. The physical limits boundary remains correct as shown	No change

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

*Saxmundham Policy Map*

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7199 - Jonathan Woodruff [3349]	Object	<p>Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Preferred Options, and</p> <p>Saxmundham Draft Conservation Area Appraisal I am writing one response to both documents because in Saxmundham they relate to the same geographical area, however they are proposing and consulting upon two different proposed outcomes, with different site designations shown on the plans. This is at best confusing and is not best practice and at worst, by consulting on two proposals in different documents, it makes those consultations unsound.</p> <p>In any case I would like to respond in connection with a site to the West of South Entrance previously identified in the SHLAA known as 12UCS/3027. This site has now been granted planning consent for residential development.</p> <p>With regard to the Important Open/Green Space protection proposed in the Draft Conservation Area Appraisal, this has been shown through the planning process to be incorrect, and this designation kindly needs to be removed, please.</p> <p>Historic England, in considering the the site's relationship with the Conservation Area, confirmed that " the site does not contribute greatly to its significance". This view has been reinforced locally by the Town Council who supported the planning application. The site is landlocked and not contiguous with the public realm and the views into the site are extremely limited to the tops of poor quality trees. The Draft Conservation Area Appraisal itself confirms that there are no important views related to the site and your Council's Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Preferred Options document does not propose this site (and others in Saxmundham) for protection. Your Council's consultation response to the Planning Application states "if consent is granted the [Draft Conservation Area] appraisal will be amended prior to adoption and final publication". I would be grateful if you would now do so, please, however it is maintained that it should never have been included in the first place due to its lack of significance.</p> <p>SHLAA Site 12UCS/3027 Your Council's Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Preferred Options document does not</p>	<p>The SAASP document does not propose to allocate land at site 3027. This is, however a moot point as planning permission DC/15/3197/FUL- was granted for 5 dwellings (decision posted 13.11.2015). Sites with planning permission for 5 or more units post 01/04/15 are shown on the Policies Map.</p> <p>Comments regarding the Saxmundham Conservation Area Appraisal should be addressed to Robert Scrimgeour, Senior Design and Conservation Officer, on 01394 444616 or email <a href="mailto:robert.scrimgeour@eastsuffolk.gov.uk">robert.scrimgeour@eastsuffolk.gov.uk</a>.</p>	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7019 - Christchurch Property Company Limited [2980] 7111 - Hopkins Homes [551]	Support	<p>propose this site (and others in Saxmundham) for protection. Your Council's consultation response to the Planning Application states "if consent is granted the [Draft Conservation Area] appraisal will be amended prior to adoption and final publication". I would be grateful if you would now do so, please, however it is maintained that it should never have been included in the first place due to its lack of significance.</p>		No change
7021 - Christchurch Property Company Limited [2980]	Support	<p>It is considered that the land abutting the southern edge of Saxmundham should be allocated in the Site Allocations document. It is submitted that the Site Allocation Document would be sound - in securing the necessary delivery for infrastructure, and an appropriate delivery of new housing - if land abutting the southern edge of Saxmundham is allocated for housing as part of an urban extension for Saxmundham.</p> <p>The proposed release of land abutting the southern edge of Saxmundham represents the most sustainable, viable and deliverable option to achieve the required housing and infrastructure needs for Saxmundham and the surrounding area</p>	<p>Comments noted. The suggestion for additional large scale development to the south of Saxmundham is not considered appropriate or necessary at this stage given the very significant levels of development to which the town has already been subject since the start of the plan period. This is a matter more appropriately considered as part of the Local Plan Review. Information provided by Suffolk County Council in respect of primary education provision indicates that a new primary school is likely to be required if additional new housing is proposed and is also suggesting that this would be a matter for the Local Plan Review.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Shottisham Policy Map</b>				
7265 - Trustees of the Adeane Bawdsey Settlement [3937]	Comment	A small-scale development of houses and bungalows in this location would be appropriate to the scale, location, and housing needs of the village of Shottisham without overpowering or compromising its amenity. The site is located directly adjacent to the Shottisham development boundary. It is anticipated that 5-10 units, subject to discussion about the size and layout of development, could be provided. This could include an element of affordable housing to help meet the local housing needs and to enable the village to grow sustainably, rather than becoming the preserve of those who already live there.	The SAASP proposes to allocate site 812D for a mix of housing and car parking provision. Site 812D is potentially better related to the centre of Shottisham, could offer better pedestrian connectivity avoiding lengthy pedestrian journeys along 'The Street' which lacks footways, and may offer a solution to community concerns regarding lack of parking provision for the village and the Sorrel Horse pub.	New policy SSP15 added to 'New Housing Allocations'.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
6980 - Shottisham Parish Council (Jenny Webb) [3679]	Comment	<p>In response to the Preferred Options for the latest SAASPDPP, Shottisham Parish Council would like to make the following comments.</p> <p>With regard to Housing Allocation in the plan, the number for Shottisham is six. Three houses have already been built, with another three required as a minimum. However potential sites for development- land east of Heath Drive and land opposite the Sorrell Horse have been discounted (see page 137) because of sustainability issues relating to off-site sewerage. This means there is no land available within the village envelope.</p> <p>The PC has identified a need for affordable housing so that young people can stay in the village and for those wishing to downsize but no land has been allocated for it. The Parish Council would like to know whether SCDC wishes SPC to put forward additional sites outside of the PLB.</p> <p>There is a secondary matter which has arisen as a result of the Draft Conservation Plan Appraisal for Shottisham which has a bearing on Site Allocations in the village. There is a serious issue regarding car parking on the Street and at a public meeting on 13th October, the idea was mooted of asking for a piece of land to be allotted for a community car park. Herewith the relevant point made at the meeting.</p> <p>Residents agreed that on-street car parking detracted from the look of the Conservation Area but that there was little alternative for villagers in most cases. A community car park would be welcomed if SCDC could show flexibility in providing a site which would not cause further traffic problems in exchange for some limited street car parking. The area opposite the pub car park which had been put forward has poor access. However, the council would like SCDC to consider a plan for a section of the Sorrell Horse field at the lower end to be made into a community car park.</p>	<p>Agree. 0.42 ha of land opposite The Sorrel Horse, The Street, Shottisham is identified as suitable for approximately 10 dwellings and, in addition to residents parking, an area of car parking.</p>	<p>New policy SSP15 added to 'New Housing Allocations'</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Snape Policy Map</b>				
6587 - Riduna Holdings Limited [3711]	Comment	<p>The 1ha. Site presently accommodates 4 large steel framed buildings of approximately 2,500sq ft. each; with an additional 935sq.ft of hardstanding; at present the 1 hectare site accommodates three employees.</p> <p>Removal of these large under utilised buildings is proposed; a positive contribution to the AONB. The relocating of the employment use to the north of site with low scale traditionally designed work units is proposed, with the existing Brick Kin Park for low density residential use.</p> <p>The central area of the overall site remaining a non-buildable area, retaining openness of the AONB at this location.</p>	<p>The proposal to allocate 3023PO for housing is contrary to Core Strategy policies SP5 - Employment land and SP19 - Settlement Policy where the emphasis is on retention of existing businesses and areas in employment use to provide opportunities for expansion and start-up.</p>	No change.
<b>Theberton Policy Map</b>				
6868 - Portland Planning (Mrs Gill Davidson) [2867]	Support	<p>I strongly SUPPORT the proposed removal of the physical limits boundary from Eastbridge in the parish of Theberton. Eastbridge does not meet the criteria to be classified as a local service centre and removal of its physical limits is consistent with the approach taken in definition of sustainable settlements.</p>	Support noted.	No change
<b>Thorpeness Policy Map</b>				
7329 - Mr G Ogilvie [3382]	Comment	<p>It is our contention that if the Council have properly assessed the reasonable alternatives as required by the EU Directive, the Regulations and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), that site reference 3006 would perform the same as the preferred site and may even perform better and its allocation would contribute to the Council's requirements to meet objectively assessed needs for housing.</p> <p>We contend that the Council needs to go through the sustainability appraisal process, assess whether site reference 3006 meets sustainable development criteria and potentially allocate if it meets or exceeds the current Preferred Option Site.</p>	<p>All sites submitted to the Council as part of the consultation process will be subject to Sustainability Appraisal. The results of these appraisals are one element of the site allocation decision making process. The results of the Sustainability Appraisals will be published alongside the Publication Version of the Site Allocations DPD. Initial comments from Suffolk County Highways have raised concerns regarding the lack of direct access to the adopted highway at this site.</p>	No change.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7327 - Mr G Ogilvie [3382]	Comment	<p>It is our contention that if the Council have properly assessed the reasonable alternatives as required by the EU Directive, the Regulations and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), that site reference 3008 would perform the same as the preferred site and may even perform better and its allocation would contribute to the Council's requirements to meet objectively assessed needs for housing.</p> <p>We contend that the Council needs to go through the sustainability appraisal process, assess whether site reference 3008 meets sustainable development criteria and potentially allocate if it meets or exceeds the current Preferred Option Site.</p>	<p>All sites submitted to the Council as part of the consultation process will be subject to Sustainability Appraisal. The results of these appraisals are one element of the site allocation decision making process. The results of the Sustainability Appraisals will be published alongside the Publication Version of the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	No change.
<b>Tunstall Policy Map</b>				
7005 - Evolution Town Planning (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [3055]	Comment	<p>Our client's site is well placed to provide housing development in Tunstall over the plan period to 2027 and beyond. It is available for development in the short term or can be phased to meet the various phases of the local plan. It is capable of providing housing to meet local needs such as affordable housing for local people or bungalows for retirees wishing to downsize while remaining in the village. This potential is increased if the site is considered in conjunction with two neighbouring sites. Such a combined site would also have the benefit of two existing vehicular accesses.</p>	<p>Tunstall has experienced a substantial quantum of development since the start of the plan period with extant permissions for 58 units as at 31.03.2015. It is not considered appropriate to allocate any additional land for housing. The situation will be reviewed as part of the Local Plan</p>	No change.
<b>Ufford Policy Map</b>				
7213 - Artisan Planning & Property Services Ltd (Mr Leslie Short) [3923]	Object	<p>Object to this in principle and to its detail in respect of Ufford village and that proposed designated red line area around Crown Nursery in the Ufford Inset Map which is already recognised by the Council as an Employment Land site.</p> <p>Previous submissions to the Council in respect of the availability of land at Crown Nursery for housing and for employment purposes have been assessed by the Council and discounted without dialogue.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The land in question has now been granted planning permission for total of 31 residential units.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Waldringfield Policy Map</b>				
6955 - Jonathan Ruffle [181]	Comment	<p>May I draw your attention to SCDC's recent correspondence with Waldringfield Parish Council.</p> <p>I support fully the stand they are taking over the preferred options.</p>	Support noted.	No change
7196 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club [3914]	Support	<p>My client contends that a new allocation should be included in the emerging DPD covering the land shaded brown on the attached drawing reference HER001/0451/003 entitled Proposed Options Response. This allocation should enable the expansion of the existing golf course facility and the delivery of new public open space, green infrastructure and the creation of new heathland habitats subject to no adverse impact on the AONB.</p>	<p>This proposal is essentially for an enabling development linked to the future of the golf club. The site area extends across the area covered by the Site Allocations Document and the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan. It is considered that the most appropriate route for progressing this proposal is through a planning application rather than a site allocation.</p>	No change
6836 - Waldringfield Parish Council (Mr David Lines) [2859]	Support	We agree with the Revised Physical Limits (village envelope) shown in the map.	Support noted.	No change
7191 - Waldringfield Heath Golf Club [3914]	Support	<p>Seeking new allocation to enable the expansion of the existing golf course facility and the delivery of new public open space, green infrastructure and the creation of new heathland habitats subject to no adverse impact on the AONB. Allocation to include a well-being centre containing housing with care accommodation for elderly people who wish to remain as playing and social members of the Club. They will be able to stay on site in this sustainable location and use the bar, dining, external catering, management and laundry facilities on a daily basis. WHGC is aware that co-locating elderly people into a place that they want to spend their time will have a positive impact on their lives</p>	<p>From the information provided, it would appear that the scheme envisaged is an enabling development to help secure improvements to the golf club. The site lies partly within the area covered by the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan and partly within the area covered by the Site Allocations Document. It is considered that a proposal of this nature is more appropriately brought forward by means of a planning application.</p>	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Westerfield Policy Map</b>				
6968 - The Kesgrave Covenant Ltd [1342]	Comment	Our client's land to the north of Humber Doucy Lane, Ipswich, was not identified through the SHLAA process, yet it can make a valuable contribution towards local housing requirements. The site falls partially within Ipswich's Borough boundary, adjoining the urban area, and partly within Suffolk Coastal District's boundary. The part of the site that falls within Ipswich's boundary has been previously identified through their SHLAA process (site IP184) as being suitable and available for housing (and as with all other sites considered as part of the Northern Fringe, achievable subject to the provision of appropriate infrastructure).	The location and scale of development suggested for site 3516 'Land opposite Millbank House, Tuddenham Lane, Rushmere St Andrew' would be contrary to Core Strategy policy SP20 - Eastern Ipswich Plan Area where the adopted strategy for the urban corridor is for completion of existing long-standing housing allocations and other small scale development opportunities within the defined built up area. In particular, it is recognised that due to the significant levels of growth which have occurred over the past 10 or so years, communities have the opportunity to settle and mature.	No change.
7039 - Westerfield Parish Council (Mr Peter Miller) [3597]	Comment	The Parish Council consider there are merits in drawing a third physical limits boundary around the cluster at the Railway level crossing. The boundary at this locality could embrace the currently developed area together with recently approved planning applications and also the area of Old Station Works which is the subject of SSP15	Comments noted. A new physical limits boundary will be provided to the cluster of development around Westerfield station and the new allocation.	Add second physical limits boundary for Westerfield to include the existing built area around Westerfield railway station and the allocation SSP15.
7244 - Crest Nicholson [3927]	Comment	<p>The SAASP identifies two new residential sites within Westerfield that are proposed to come forward over the Plan period with a total of 30 units:</p> <p>Policy SSP14 Land south of Lower Road (1.64ha)- circa 10 units;</p> <p>Policy SSP15 Land at Old Station Works (3.65ha)- circa 20 units.</p> <p>SCDC is committed to ensuring that separation is maintained between Westerfield and the IGS. Along with the consideration of the above proposed allocations, our proposed extension to the Country Park will serve to reinforce the buffer between the IGS and Westerfield-ensuring separation is maintained, whilst also enhancing links within SCDC to the Country Park.</p>	Comments noted. A new policy is now included to allocate additional country park land where it falls within the Suffolk Coastal District Council area.	No change

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
7037 - Westerfield Parish Council (Mr Peter Miller) [3597]	Comment	<p>The Parish Council agree with the changes adding the Fullers Field site and the area in Lower Road but consider that the Revised Physical Limits for the Church Lane site should reflect the land being used for the built environment and not include the remainder of the plot retained as agricultural land. This would result in reducing the frontage of the physical limits by approximately 60 metres. This change is considered desirable in limiting further development along this road on safety grounds.</p> <p><i>The Revised Physical Limits for the Church Lane site should reflect the land being used for the built environment and not include the remainder of the plot retained as agricultural land</i></p>	Comments noted. The physical limits boundary will be drawn to correctly reflect the area for which planning permission has been granted.	Amend physical limits boundary for Westerfield to reflect the extent of the land with planning permission on Church Lane
<b>Yoxford Policy Map</b>				
7114 - Hopkins Homes [551]	Support	<p>Hopkins Homes have an interest at Land West of Old High Road, Yoxford. A planning application was submitted in January 2013 for a residential development of 26 homes (C/13/0024) which was refused; a subsequent appeal was dismissed in July 2014 however this decision was quashed at the High Court in January 2015.</p> <p>Hopkins Homes maintains that the site represents a suitable, unconstrained site to deliver sustainable residential development for the village.</p> <p><i>A policy should be added to the Plan to allocate the site for at least 26 dwellings</i></p>	Comments noted. This site remains subject to a legal challenge.	No change



**This document is available in large print or can  
be translated into another language.  
Contact the Planning & Policy Team on  
01394 444761**

如果你有需要，我們可以把這份單張翻譯成另一種語言 **Chinese**

Na życzenie przetłumaczmy niniejszą ulotkę na inny język **Polish**

Contacte-nos, caso deseje este folheto traduzido para outra língua. **Portuguese**

Planning Policy and Delivery Team  
Suffolk Coastal District Council  
Council Offices  
Melton Hill  
Woodbridge  
Suffolk  
IP12 1AU

Tel: **01394 444761 / 01394 444558**  
E-mail: [suffolkcoastallocalplan@eastsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:suffolkcoastallocalplan@eastsuffolk.gov.uk)