

**Supporting Document 20 - Summary of Comments and Responses on the Submission Draft Eye Neighbourhood Plan (Nov/Dec 2019) – Final**

**AMP = a member of the public**

No.	Section/Para/Policy	Name	Comment	Response
	<b>Preface/General</b>			
		MSDC	Refers to Eye ‘Parish Council’ consistently in its response	<b>ACTION</b> – MSDC be asked to recognise that Eye has a Town Council.
			Comprehensive and well considered blueprint. Based on views expressed by residents and evidence. Acknowledges the need for growth and how this can be achieved sympathetically with mix of housing and services and facilities. Concern that importance will not be recognised by all residents.	<b>Comments noted.</b> Leaflets have been delivered to all households and briefing meetings and exhibitions well publicised and all material on the Town website.
		AMP	Support the Plan especially the desire to accommodate growth without undermining the assets of a small town such as independent retailers.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	The Plan is excellent	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Presume the proposals are prepared by developers and planners. Why is Eye in the same category as Stowmarket and Sudbury which are much bigger? Why is so much development being proposed if local people do have a say in the decision.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> - The Plan has been prepared by representatives of the Town not planners and developers and takes into account the views of local people expressed during a number of consultations.
		AMP	Appreciate the Plan – opportunity to prevent further damage to the inner Town.	<b>Comments noted</b>
		AMP	Objects to residential development of the old Library	<b>Comments noted.</b> This already had planning permission and is therefore not dealt with in the Plan.
		AMP	Objects to the proposals for the County Council buildings on Cross Street.	<b>Comments noted.</b> This already had planning permission and is therefore not dealt with in the Plan.
		AMP	Support the Town Council’s enthusiasm	<b>Comments noted.</b>

	Amber REI Holdings by Pegasus Planning	Acknowledge the proactive approach assumed by the Eye Steering Group. We recognise the important part they are playing in identifying, synthesising and delivering the vision of the Eye Community using the Neighbourhood Development Plan Process.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	AMP	It's a good plan	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	AMP	A forward thinking plan that deserves implementation	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	AMP	My congratulations to all involved for a very professional document which, on the whole and if accepted, will serve Eye well for the next few years. My thanks to all involved for the hard work that it must have entailed.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	T W Baldwin	<p>We would welcome further engagement with Town Council moving forward in order to assist in shaping a positive Neighbourhood Plan, which fully addresses the housing needs of Eye and the wider district of Mid Suffolk.</p> <p>Our client supports the principle of bringing forward a Neighbourhood Plan to shape and guide the future growth of Eye. Eye is a sustainable settlement and, as such, will play a key role in delivering the housing needs of the district.</p> <p>As set out in these representations it is recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan is subject to review following the publication of the Regulation 18 Joint Local Plan. At this point the housing needs of the district and the role Eye has to play in delivering these needs will become apparent. By being in conformity with the strategic policies of the emerging Joint Local Plan the Eye Neighbourhood Plan would conform with paragraphs 29 and 66 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Our client's land to the north and south of Castleton Way has a key role to play in delivering the growth and infrastructure the town needs moving forward, as such, we would welcome the opportunity to engage with the Town Council further regarding the proposed designations and allocations in the draft Plan.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> - The Plan may need review once the Joint Local Plan becomes a material consideration but the timetable for this is unclear and has consistently slipped – the next Consultation Document now not likely until summer 2019.</p> <p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> - There is no requirement in legislation or recommendations that prevent a Neighbourhood Plan progressing even though there is no up to date Local Plan.</p>

			<p>Having reviewed the draft Plan and the evidence base underpinning the Plan our client's land remains, in our view, the most sustainable, available and deliverable site for major housing development in the town.</p> <p>We do not consider the Neighbourhood Plan to be in a form whereby it would satisfy the 'basic conditions' set out at Paragraph (2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act. Our client would welcome the opportunity to work with the Town Council to develop a sound and robust Neighbourhood Plan for Eye, which would deliver on the aspirations of the local community and the wider housing needs of the district.</p>	<p>The Town Council is willing to meet any parties – meeting held 11/3/19.</p> <p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> - it is not clear why the responder considers that the ENP does not meet the 'basic conditions' set out in Para (2) of Schedule 4B. As stated above there is no legislation or regulations that prevent a Neighbourhood Plan progressing in advance of a Local Plan and the absence of up to date strategic housing requirements. The Debenham NP is in the same position and has passed through its examination stage and moving to referendum for example.</p>
		Suffolk Preservation Society	<p>We congratulate the Neighbourhood Plan team on the commitment and endeavour required to produce the draft document. SPS recognises the importance of identifying a vision for the future of your town and the need for the identification of sites for new housing development. Nevertheless the ambitious aspirations for growth of the town will make it even more necessary to put in place robust policies that will safeguard the special heritage and landscape qualities of Eye.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b> The special heritage and landscape qualities of Eye do need safeguarding and there are policies in the Plan to achieve this. The design guidance being prepared by AECOM will provide further detailed guidance for developers.</p>
		AMP	<p>I agree with the plan.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p>
		AMP	<p>This appears to be a comprehensive, detailed and well thought out framework from which Eye can develop and grow. I thank you all and would like to see the plan implemented asap so Eye has some input to its future.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p>
		AMP	<p>Support the Plan</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p>
		AMP	<p>Support the Plan</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p>

		AMP	In general I am in support of the Plan and consider it to be well constructed and comprehensive. I would like to see car parking plans expanded and included in all developments wherever possible.	<b>Comments noted.</b> Parking standards in development will need to conform to the County wide parking standards.
		AMP	In general I support the issues raised in the Plan.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	I recognise that the Eye Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2036 is a document of considerable merit and in its preparation has clearly benefited from a very high level of professional input. Broadly I support the policies set out – their implementation should be monitored with the same degree of attention as is evident in their formulation. Eye’s unique historic character should be preserved.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	On the whole I support the Plan.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Support the Plan except for policies 7 and 8.	<b>Comments noted</b> – see below re policies 7 and 8
		AMP	Look at other options for housing once Langton area is completed – traffic complexities including good traffic difficult in a rural town. I support many of CPREs concerns about rural development.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the comment seems to be that no additional housing sites should be identified before the 280 south of Eye airfield is completed. A number of sites are allocated for specific purposes for example to achieve the redevelopment of the Chicken Factory and the District wide housing requirements indicate that additional housing development over and above the 280 homes will be required.
		Suffolk County Council	Suffolk County Council is supportive of the Town Council’s vision for the area and welcomes the active engagement prior to formal consultation undertaken by the Town Council. In this letter we aim to highlight potential issues and opportunities in the plan and are happy to discuss anything that is raised.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	In general we have no objections to any part of the proposed plan. Listed below are what we feel are some priorities: Eye 5 Chicken Factory Eye 25 – Parking Eye 6 – Paddock House	<b>Comments noted.</b>

			<p>Eye 12 – Food Retail          Eye 13 – Crematorium          Eye 16 – Development outside settlement boundary          Eye 18 – Landscape area          Eye 19 – Visually Important Open Space</p>	
		AMP	<p>Firstly I recognise the great deal of thought and work that has gone into the plan with regard to developing strategies for future needs. This I realise would have been time consuming, and I suspect has not always been an easy task for those involved. Recognising this I am reluctant to share my concerns, however I believe it is important to do so.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b> – see concerns related to specific policies below.</p>
		Environment Agency	<p>Our principle aims are to protect and improve the environment, and to promote sustainable development, we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ Act to reduce climate change and its consequences.</li> <li>☑ Protect and improve water, land and air.</li> <li>☑ Work with people and communities to create better places.</li> <li>☑ Work with businesses and other organisations to use resources wisely.</li> </ul> <p>You may find the following document useful. It explains our role in the planning process in more detail and describes how we work with others; it provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ An overview of our role in development and when you should contact us.</li> <li>☑ Initial advice on how to manage the environment impact and opportunities of development.</li> <li>☑ Signposting to further information which will help you with development.</li> <li>☑ Links to the consents and permits you or developers may need from us.</li> </ul> <p>Our role in development and how we can help:  <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/289894/LIT_2745_c8ed3d.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/289894/LIT_2745_c8ed3d.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b> – seek EAs support in developing the infrastructure plan.</p>

	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>Reminds about the basic conditions and national planning guidance and planning practice guidance drawing out the need to support strategic needs set out in Local Plans and the need to be flexible enough to be consistent with the emerging BMSDCs joint local plan.</p> <p>SEA screening should be undertaken.</p> <p>Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic condition a – it does not conform with national policy and guidance.</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> –this is a non sequitur the ENP does not have to be flexible enough to be consistent with the Local Plan but it may need reviewing once the Local Plan becomes a material consideration.</p> <p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> - it is not clear why the ENP does not meet the ‘basic conditions’ set out in Para (2) of Schedule 4B. As stated above there is no legislation or regulations that prevent a Neighbourhood Plan progressing in advance of a Local Plan and the absence of up to date strategic housing requirements. The Debenham NP is in the same position and has passed through its examination stage and proceeding to referendum for example.</p>
	MSDC	<p>The last sentence of fourth para of the Preface are inappropriate in a statutory planning document.</p> <p>Last Para should say ‘Town Clerk’.</p> <p>In acknowledgements suggest saying officers of Mid Suffolk District Council rather than giving names.</p> <p>MSDC will consult on the Joint District Local Plan in early 2019.</p> <p>It will include consultation on the preferred spatial strategy, the distribution of housing and site allocations</p> <p>If substantive changes are made to the ENP it made be appropriate to reconsult on the plan.</p> <p>The period to be covered by the plan should be clearly stated.</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – this sets an important context for the ENP.</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – but these contact details will not appear in the Submission draft of the Plan.</p> <p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the officers named have been helpful in preparing the Plan other officers at MSDC have not been.</p> <p><b>Comments noted.</b></p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b></p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – add further references to the Plan period.</p>
<b>Section 1 - Introduction</b>			
	MSDC	<p>Para 1.17 is inappropriate in a statutory planning document.</p> <p>Para 1.1 line 8 ‘place’</p> <p>Para 1.5 Add “and other material considerations” at end</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – this sets an important context for the ENP. If the complaint to the monitoring officer leads to a resolution of the CIL issue this could be removed.</p>

			<p>Para 1.9 line 2 - Insert “<i>sustainable</i>” between “of” and “development”</p> <p>Para 1.19 – 1.23 Will need to be updated to cover responses to the Pre-Submission consultation and the changes made in the Submission Plan as a result</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend ‘placed’ to ‘place’</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – add wording suggested</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – add sustainable as suggested</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b></p>
	<b>Section 2 - Evidence</b>			
		MSDC	Para 2.16 will need to be updated	<b>ACCEPTED</b>
	<b>Section 3 – A vision for Eye</b>			
		MSDC	Para 3.1 - We suggest showing the bullet point descriptions in bold text e.g. “ <b>An attractive town</b> ”	<b>ACCEPTED</b>
		Amber REI	Amber REI generally support these Vision Statements as they set the basis for the NDP to achieve and deliver sustainable development in line with the Development Plan Framework, National Policy and guidance	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Support the vision statements and policies 1,2,3,4,5,6 9,11,12,15,16,18,19 20,21,22,23,24,25,26 28,29,30,31,32,33	<b>Comments noted.</b>

	<b>Section 4 – Housing Proposals</b>			
		MSDC	Whilst it is not possible to provide certainty on the likely housing requirements for Eye now this should be available in early 2019. MSDC will work closely with the Parish Council to ensure consistency. Given the quantum of residual supply to be identified MSDC cannot rule out the need to identify a site or sites in the Joint Local Plan additional to those identified in the Neighbourhood Plan.	<b>Comments noted</b> – the Town Council has sought to work closely with MSDC for some time without response from the District Council. A change of approach by MSDC would be welcome. The District Council should identify the numbers of homes required rather than identify specific sites which is the role of the ENP. The next joint Local Plan consultation document is not now expected until at least the Summer of 2019.
		MSDC	Para 4.7 line 5 “fewer” rather than “less”	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend as suggested.
		MSDC	This should include a discussion on the overall level of growth proposed by the Plan and a new policy which sets this out. We suggest the following wording:	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – while there is discussion about the overall level of growth already a summary policy will be added as suggested to reflect the sites allocated in the Plan.

			<p><i>This Plan provides for around 683 dwellings to be developed in the Neighbourhood Plan area between 2018 and 2036. This growth will be met through:</i></p> <p><i>i. The allocation of the following sites for 10 or more new homes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a. Land south of Eye Airfield – around 280 dwellings</i></li> <li><i>b. Eye Health Centre and Hartismere Health and Care – around 43 dwellings</i></li> <li><i>c. Chicken Factory, Yaxley Road – around 72 dwellings</i></li> <li><i>d. Paddock House, Church Street – around 22 dwellings</i></li> <li><i>e. Land north of Victoria Mill Allotments – around 34 dwellings</i></li> <li><i>f. Victoria Mill Allotments – around 72 dwellings</i></li> </ul> <p><i>as indicated on the Policies Map; and</i></p> <p><i>ii. an allowance of 160 dwellings on small “windfall” sites of under 10 dwellings that come forward within the settlement boundary during the plan period and not identified elsewhere in the Plan.”</i></p> <p><i>In addition a reserve site is identified for around 174 dwellings south of Eye Airfield</i></p>	
	<b>Para 4.11</b>			
		Occold Parish Council	<p>The Plan mentions that Eye will have to provide for the housing needs of the populations of a “cluster of surrounding villages and hamlets” although “there is no information to quantify this need”, so it over provides “by about 10%” (item 4-11, page 32). We assume that the surrounding villages / hamlets are as mentioned on page 14, in which case we suggest that this may not be wide enough eg. Thorndon. Can you clarify this please?</p>	<b>CLARIFICATION</b> – the functional cluster is identified in the Local Plan which therefore provides strategic guidance for the ENP.
		AMP	<p>My first concern is that the proposed housing development within the town is in my opinion excessive, and the plan in part is dependent on the introduction of substantial increased housing. This I believe is partly recognised by those drafting the plan, since thought has been given to needs that greater housing would necessitate, such as new schools, car parks, shops, and an extension by relocation of the existing doctors surgery. However</p>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – a number of sites are allocated for specific purposes for example to achieve the redevelopment of the Chicken Factory and the District wide housing requirements indicate that additional housing development over and above the 280 homes already permitted will be required. The Plan seeks to mitigate the impact on infrastructure

			what is not addressed is the detrimental impacts that excessive development will have. One example of this is the road congestion that is already sometimes present in the town centre. This congestion will increase further with future housing development, and potentially further still if Eye becomes an even greater service centre to the hinterland villages. Therefore whilst I recognise that future housing in Eye is both inevitable and necessary, I would respectfully suggest that housing on the scale proposed in the plan will actually prove detrimental.	by proposing specific improvements such as additional car parking and requiring other things such as a Traffic Management Plan.
	<b>Para 4.12</b>			
		AMP	685 houses near the Airfield will create a new town unconnected to the current Town.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – not all of the 685 dwellings are near the Airfield and measures such as new cycling and walking routes are proposed to improve linkages.
	<b>Eye 1 and 2 – Housing Tenures and House Types</b>			
		AMP	The Plan takes a positive evidence based approach to assessing housing need and uses this to determine the number by housing tenure and type.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		Gladman Developments Ltd.	Housing needs change over time so recommend adding ‘or evidenced through an up to date assessment’. Concerned that affordable housing requirements threaten viability.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – the ENP may need to be reviewed if the adopted Local Plan contains a housing requirement higher than the provision in the ENP including the reserve site already identified in the Plan. <b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – in a Plan led system the Plan should be reviewed if a higher housing allocation is required rather than building in flexibility now. <b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> - Affordable housing requirements are supported by the Viability Assessment.
		T W Baldwin	At present the Neighbourhood Plan aims to meet housing needs not by responding to a specific target figure, but by meeting an identified local need for a specific type of housing.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – there is no specific target figure available because MSDC’s Local Plan is 20 years out of date. The adopted approach is therefore to seek

			<p>Born out of the findings of the AECOM Housing Needs Assessment, Policy Eye 1 identifies the total provision of affordable housing and sheltered housing required in the town. Policy Eye 2 defines a prescriptive house type mix for residential developments to follow.</p> <p>Whilst it is important that the local needs and views are taken into in the drafting of Neighbourhood planning policies, the provisions of Policy 1 and Policy 2 do not take into account district wide requirements to be set by an emerging Joint Local Plan. As currently drafted Policy 1 and Policy 2 are highly inflexible and do not represent wider housing needs. It is recommended that these policies are reviewed upon publication of the draft Joint Local Plan and that the Town Council state the findings of the Housing Needs Assessment are a starting point or a consideration only for applicants devising a housing mix to support a viable and deliverable housing mix.</p>	<p>to meet the housing needs of young and older households and to bring forward sites the development of which would benefit the Town.</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – the ENP may need to be reviewed if the adopted Local Plan contains a housing requirement higher than the provision in the ENP including the reserve site already identified in the Plan.  <b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – in a Plan led system the Plan should be reviewed if a higher housing allocation is required rather than building in flexibility now.</p>
		MSDC	<p>Policy 1 - Only the last sentence can be implemented as a development management policy. The remainder is a statement about the intended outcome of the Plan. In final sentence replace “less” with “fewer”.</p> <p>Policy 2 - As different sites will have a different mix of development this policy cannot be implemented through the development management process. This is more a statement about the intended outcome of the Plan.</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – retain the development policy element of Policy Eye 1 and put the rest in text</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – move Policy Eye 2 to text.</p>
	<b>Para 4.2</b>			
		MSDC	<p>Agrees meeting housing needs of young people vitality important and that the needs of older people should be met. We are an aging population and for people to feel they can stay in their homes and feel secure with a warden in place is imperative. When the council took away the warden in Tacon Close and other facilities it caused a great deal of distress.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p>

		T W Baldwin	<p>The preparation of the new Joint Local Plan is a critical factor in shaping and determining the level of growth that the Eye Neighbourhood Plan will be required to deliver in the period 2018-2036. We believe the housing need target in Mid Suffolk will rise to be in the region of 585 dwellings per annum. Given Eye's position in the settlement hierarchy and its inherent sustainability as a location to accommodate growth it is anticipated that it will be afforded significant growth in the Joint Local Plan. As such, in the coming months the Eye Neighbourhood Plan will need to respond proactively and positively to the content of the Regulation 18 consultation. Using the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Options put forward in the 2017 Regulation 18 consultation, and when applying the 585 per annum housing need figure, Eye could potentially attract a strategic growth target of between 702 and 1,229 dwellings over the Plan period.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan's approach to delivering housing growth is reviewed following the publication of the Joint Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation in January 2019.</p> <p>There are significant doubts about the availability and deliverability of some of the sites identified in the Plan – see comments on sites below.</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – the ENP may need to be reviewed if the adopted Local Plan contains a housing requirement higher than the provision in the ENP including the reserve site already identified in the Plan.</p> <p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> - The allocations in the plan and the reserve site already provide for about 740 homes – more than the bottom of the range suggested. If all of the land promoted by Mr Baldwin were allocated in addition to existing allocations over 2000 homes would be developed well above the higher end of the range suggested. The next Local Plan consultation document is not now expected until summer 2019 and the first draft Local Plan is likely not to be published until after the ENP has been put to a referendum.</p> <p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – see site specific comments and responses.</p>
		T W Baldwin	<p><b>LAND TO THE NORTH AND SOUTH OF CASTLETON WAY</b></p> <p>In light of our concerns regarding availability of some of the proposed residential site allocations it is strongly recommended that our client's land to the north and south of Castleton Way and west of Victoria Hill is allocated for residential development in the Neighbourhood Plan. The land promoted for development through the 2017 SHELAA measures approximately 40ha in area and will provide a logical extension</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b> – that Mr Baldwin is proposing 40 ha of land which would provide for about 1400 homes which, in addition to the 685 homes proposed in the Plan would see a threefold increase in the size of the Town and provision 800 dwellings higher than the range he suggests <i>might</i> be required by the new Local Plan.</p>

		<p>to the Land south of Eye Airfield site which currently benefits from outline permission.</p> <p><b>Reserve Site Allocation</b></p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan currently seeks to allocate part of our client’s land, north of Castleton Way, as a ‘Reserve site’ for residential development of 174 dwellings should further residential development be required before the end of the Plan period. Table 4 of the Plan currently identifies the site as coming forward in in the period 2029-2036.</p> <p>The proposed ‘Reserve site’ is available and deliverable in the short term and should be afforded full allocation status in the Neighbourhood Plan. The reserve allocation site is fully capable of delivering dwellings at an earlier stage in the Plan period than currently proposed. It is strongly recommended that Table 4 of the Plan is amended to take into account the short-term deliverability of the proposed ‘Reserve site’ and the significant development constraints and challenges facing other proposed residential allocations in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Additional Land North and South of Castleton Way</b></p> <p>The remainder of our client’s land, to the north and south Castleton Way, has not been recognised as a site for future residential development in the draft Plan. The additional land promoted by our client has been divided into three separate land parcels (Sites 2, 5 and 6) in the AECOM Site Assessment document. Set out below are comments on the AECOM site assessment (see end of this table)</p> <p>Taken as a whole the 40ha of land to the north and south of Castleton would form a logical and sustainable extension to the town of Eye. The land promoted by our client is available for development and is subject to limited constraints, especially when compared to sites 10, 11 and 13 (as identified in the AECOM Assessment document) which have then been put forward for allocation in the draft Plan.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			Given the constraints and challenges facing other proposed allocation sites it is recommended that further consideration is given to development potential of the additional land to the north and south of Castleton Way.	
		AMP	Density too high for Eye – will accept some changes but not on this scale. What is the purpose of this high density project? How to accommodate a technical project to fulfil the needs, aspirations, way of life of people.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the densities proposed are in line with national guidance.
		AMP	I generally support the housing proposals outlined in the plan, and the aim of both ETC and MSDC to supply affordable housing to meet identified need, and particularly to retain younger households in Eye. The plan does not outline in detail how that will be achieved, and my proposal offers a unique means to help achieve this, and addresses the identified aim for Eye to become a more green, sustainable town. The draft plan highlights the strength of community in Eye, and the need to integrate any new housing development with the existing town, which lends itself to the inclusion of a specific community led low impact housing scheme within the overall housing proposal. Current government housing policy includes plans to double the amount of self build and custom build housing across the UK (see Right to Build) with funding streams available to support communities and partnerships to develop self build schemes. ETC owned land could be considered for that purpose, perhaps focussing the identified percentage of affordable homes as plots for self build, even retaining current allotment land into the landscaped design of the site/plots. Such a scheme could be arranged in partnership with a housing association and with MSDC and there are examples of other councils who have already started self build schemes. Such a scheme in Eye would be unique in Suffolk, something for ETC to take the lead on and could include the opportunity for young people to gain and share new skills in building, gain valuable work experience and	<b>Comments noted.</b> Self-build can be considered as an option when developing implementation plans if the Town Council's decides to develop either the agricultural land and/or the allotments.

			help create a future for Eye as a healthy, green, community friendly environment. I suggest this is included in the final copy of the Neighbourhood Plan.	
	<b>Eye 2 – House types</b>			
		Amber REI	The Housing Needs Survey specifies a housing needs figure of 164 homes by 2036. However this figure is not related to any strategic housing requirement for the area and therefore Policy Eye 2 should have limited weight.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – there is no strategic housing requirement and statute and regulations allow NPs to proceed without one – e.g. Debenham.
	<b>Para 4.15 line 7</b>			
		MSDC	Delete <i>“it is disappointing that”</i>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – it is disappointing that no provision is made for community facilities
	<b>Para 4.15 - 17</b>			
		MSDC	Land South of Eye Airfield – The north eastern portion of this development has the potential to impact the listed building at Langton Green, specifically Langton Grove (Farmhouse, Grade II) and some potentially curtilage listed barns. The proposal appears to include the demolition of the modern farm buildings to the west of these, so there may be potential to enhance the setting of Langton Grove and any historic/curtilage barns, by increasing the open setting and removing unsympathetic later additions. The remains of Victoria windmill to the south west of the development site may be considered a non-designated heritage asset, although broadly a ruin.	<b>Comments noted</b> – the site already has outline planning permission granted by MSDC and reserved matters are currently being considered. Its not clear what the Neighbourhood Plan can add to this process or what the comments seek to achieve.
	<b>Eye 3 – Land South of Eye Airfield</b>			
		AMP	Support the development of the Hartismere site as proposed – it will enable the better use of the Hospital building and facilities.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	<b>Eye 4 – Land at eye Health centre and</b>	AMP	Support the redevelopment of the Local Surgery and its move into Hartismere Health and Care.	<b>Comments noted.</b>

	<b>Hartismere Health and Care</b>			
		AMP	Support the proposal as it would make better use of Hartismere Health and Care.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		MSDC	Say <i>“is proposed for”</i> rather than <i>“should be developed for”</i>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – make wording change suggested
		Environment Agency	Policy Eye 4, Supporting document 5: Site Assessment Report states that due to existing hospital use the site could contain contaminated land. Our data maps show that the sites lies within Source Protection Zones (SPZ) 1, 2 and 3 and groundwater vulnerability would be high to the presence of contamination. Site investigations may be required at application stage if allocated to determine on-site risks.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – make reference to this in the plan text and policy Eye 4.
		AMP	Hartismere Hospital should be better used.	<b>Comments noted</b> – the use of Hartismere Health and Care is not a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan as it is not a land use matter but the Infrastructure Plan that supports the NP will address the issue.
		AMP	Objects to the use of land at Hartismere for housing as it should be retained for future health demand.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the building is already underused and it is unlikely that additional land/buildings will be required in the foreseeable future.
		AMP	Supports the Health Centre moving into Hartismere Health and Care	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Although having sheltered housing together close to medical facilities seems like a good idea it could lead to isolation and the sites are a long way from the Town Centre. Ensure a good mix of types of housing and give consideration to the needs of former service personnel.	<b>Comments noted</b> – policy Eye 4 does propose a mix of market and sheltered housing and there is already sheltered housing in the area. Not aware of any schemes that provide housing specifically for former service personnel or if there is an identified need.
		T W Baldwin	The Site Assessment document prepared by AECOM states that the availability of this site is unknown and, as such, the site cannot be listed as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. In light of these comments and the requirements of the NPPF regarding suitable and deliverable sites for housing we have significant concerns regarding the robustness of this proposed site allocation.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – NPPF supports the development of brownfield land. The site allocation does not require any conversions and affordable housing is not required by the policy. Sheltered housing does not require any subsidy. The red rating in the AECOM site assessment reflects that fact that the views of the land owners were

			<p>A significant proportion (the majority) of this site is brownfield land so that there is potential for any development to be subject to significant remediation and demolition costs. Draft Policy Eye 4 requires 29 (67%) of the 43 proposed dwellings to be sheltered accommodation, as such, we have concerns regarding the ability to bring forward a viable development in line with the proposed mix requirements. Our concerns regarding viability would be equally applicable if some of the buildings on site were to be subject to conversion as stated in the Site Assessment document.</p> <p>We note the published Housing Viability Assessment found a scheme of 23 dwellings at this site to be unviable at 35% affordable housing provision and marginal/approaching viable at 22.4% affordable housing. The proposed allocation capacity (43 dwellings) and 67% sheltered accommodation was not tested in the viability assessment.</p> <p><b>Summary: This site is potentially unavailable and according to the published evidence base documents. The mix of development set out in the Viability Assessment differs to that put forward for allocation in the Plan.</b></p> <p><b>The site was assigned a red rating in the AECOM Site Assessment document.</b></p>	<p>then unknown – it is now known that the NHS supports the development in principle.</p>
		AMP	<p>Supports the policy but would like to see greater emphasis on the development/consideration of medical facilities including an increase in the number of doctors needed to serve the proposed development.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b> – the use of the building and the number of doctors is not a matter for the ENP but it will be addressed in the accompanying Infrastructure Plan.</p>
		Suffolk County Council	<p>It is recommended a clause is added to this policy requiring archaeological evaluation prior to the granting of planning permission.</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – add this clause to the policy.</p>
		NHS Property Services	<p>NHS Property Services (NHSPS) as landowner support the sites identification for alternative uses under Policy Eye 4, however recommend some modifications to the Policy and Supporting text.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p>

			<p>NHSPS’s Property Strategy team has been supporting Clinical Commissioning Groups and Sustainability and Transformation Plan groups to look at ways of better using the local health and public estate. This will include identifying opportunities to reconfigure the estate to better meet commissioning needs, as well as opportunities for delivering new homes (and other appropriate land uses) on surplus sites emerging from this process.</p> <p>By way of background, local health commissioners are currently developing a strategy for the future delivery of health services in this area. This may involve the release of certain NHSPS landholdings which are no longer required for the delivery of health services.</p> <p>Until the future commissioning requirements for the site are confirmed, additional flexibility is required within Policy Eye 4 to support any future development opportunities. The suggested amendments are shown as tracked changes below. The following amendments would therefore be supported;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Para 4.18 –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <del>There is potential for the Local Health Centre to move into Hartismere Health and Care. A significant concern in the Town is the under-use of Hartismere Health and Care and the consolidation of health facilities within the building is desirable. This change would provide the opportunity for a housing development on a site encompassing the surgery and adjacent under-used land and buildings which are part of Hartismere Health and Care NHS estate (see figure 3)</del></li> <li>○ Health commissioners are currently developing a strategy for the future delivery of health services in this area. This may result in parts of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – change para 4.18 as proposed.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>the site (see figure 3) being declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS, and would therefore be available for alternative use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Para 4.19</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The site of 0.74 hectares is set within an area of sheltered housing, care homes, residential properties and health services. <del>and could provide many of the 70 sheltered housing units that are estimated to be required to meet the needs of the older population over the Plan period.</del> Pending confirmation of operational healthcare requirements, <del>A</del> any part of the site declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS will be considered suitable for residential use. <del>sheltered housing is proposed.</del></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Policy Eye 4 - Land at Eye Health Centre and Hartismere Health and Care</b>  Health commissioners are currently developing a strategy for the future delivery of health services in this area. As part of this strategy, part of the site 'Land at Eye Health Centre/Hartismere Health and Care (0.74 hectares)' <del>should be developed for housing</del> may become available for redevelopment during the plan period. Any part of the site that is declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS by health commissioners, is considered suitable and available for residential use. <del>Approximately 0.4 hectares should be developed for market housing providing approximately 14 dwellings at 35 dwellings per hectare and the remaining 0.34 hectares should be developed for sheltered housing at 85 units</del></li> </ul>	<p><b>PARTLY ACCEPTED</b> – amend as proposed but retain the deleted text that refers to sheltered housing as this is required to meet some of the housing needs requirement.</p> <p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the policy should not contain explanation which belongs in the accompanying text and the specific proposal that the site should be used for a mix of affordable and market housing should be retained for the reasons stated above.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<del>per hectare providing about 29 units.</del> The type of housing should be consistent with Policy Eye 2 and Electric Vehicle Charging should be provided in accord with Policy Eye 29	
	<b>Para 4.20 – 4.23</b>			
		MSDC	Land at Eye Chicken Factory – Maps show some pre-1886 buildings exist on the site, probably related to the former railway station here. They are not listed but may be considered non-designated heritage assets. The current plan suggests they would be demolished. Demolishing the modern chicken factory would enhance their setting, but the proposed development suggested might not make an enhancement. Any scheme here must carefully consider the setting.	<b>PARTLY ACCEPTED</b> – the Plan makes no proposals for the former station building but it is not clear what change this comment is seeking to achieve. The design guidance refers to the building and a reference to it will be made in the text.
	<b>Eye 5 – Chicken Factory Yaxley Road Eye</b>			
		AMP	Support the redevelopment of the Chicken Factory	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	A complex site but its development will have a positive impact on the Town.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		MSDC	Say “ <i>is proposed for</i> ” rather than “ <i>should be redeveloped for</i> ” The Council supports redevelopment of the chicken factory site subject to the Plan making provision to facilitate maximum employment use of the site (sufficient to ensure/maintain site redevelopment viability), and that redevelopment for retail does not impact negatively on existing town centre retail provision.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – make the wording change proposed.  <b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the wording of the comment makes it unclear what change if any is requested. If it means that employment uses are preferred on the site this is not accepted. Residential and retail uses are most appropriate for the historic town centre location and substantial existing and future employment is provided with the Airfield Employment Area.
		Environment Agency	Policy Eye 5 – We note the water abstraction licenses on site and previous use, again this site would be vulnerable to contamination. The site is also partially in Flood Zones 2 and 3, we note the western part of the site is only earmarked for sports pitches as detailed in supporting document 5 but any	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – add reference to the sequential approach, the need for a Flood Risk Assessment and that site investigations may be required at application stage if allocated to determine on-site contamination risks.

			residential development would need to ensure the sequential approach is applied and be supported by a site specific Flood Risk Assessment.	
		AMP	I support suggested proposals for chicken factory site, but have some concerns about suitability with reference to ground contamination and relevant water table.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – see requirements to be added above.
		AMP	Supports the redevelopment of the Chicken Factory but wants to know how it will be achieved.	<b>Comments noted</b> – the site will be brought forward for development by its owners.
		Amber REI	We support the inclusion and allocation of the site in the NDP, it will contribute well to achieving the NDP Vision Statements and National Policy objectives to achieve sustainable development and enhance the local area. We support the justification to remove affordable housing liability on the site as it will positively improve the schemes viability. Particularly considering the need to relocate the factory and maintain employment.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		Amber REI	The site should be extended to include land in the same ownership to the west of the site shown in the Plan. This site already has planning permission for 85 car parking spaces. This would allow more of the remainder of the land to be developed thereby increasing the viability of the development.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – the site area will be extended to include the land west of the factory buildings. The proposal to provide 83 car parking spaces rather than the proposed 50 is welcome. The policy will be revised to propose housing, retail with operational car parking and additional public car parking.
		Amber REI	Remove requirement for EV charging in accord with Policy Eye 29 and Supporting Document 15.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> - the NPPF supports the provision of EV charging: <i>Paragraph 105 of the NPPF states that ‘local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should consider... e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.’</i> <i>Paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that ‘applications for development should... be designed to enable charging of plug-in and</i>

				<p><i>other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.'</i></p> <p>In addition, Suffolk County-wide adopted parking standards<sup>1</sup> apply:</p> <p><i>Section 3.4.2 of the Suffolk Parking Standards states that "Access to charging points should be made available in every residential dwelling."</i></p> <p><i>Section 3.4.2 of the Suffolk Parking Standards states that "The developer shall provide and maintain an electricity supply for charging points. A minimum of 1 space per every 20 non-residential spaces should have charging points installed for electric vehicles."</i></p> <p>Taking this guidance into account Policy Eye 29 will be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>Thresholds and requirements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All dwellings with off road parking - one point per dwelling</i></li> <li>• <i>Dwellings with communal (non-designated) parking – 10% of car park spaces</i></li> <li>• <i>New build pubs/hotels/restaurants – 10% of car park spaces or Bespoke depending on the site</i></li> <li>• <i>Commercial with staff parking (greater than 10 spaces) – 5% of car park spaces</i></li> </ul>
		AMP	Supports the redevelopment of the Chicken Factory	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Full support for the redevelopment of the chicken factory	<b>Comments noted.</b>

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/2015-11-16-FINAL-2015-Updated-Suffolk-Guidance-for-Parking.pdf>

		T W Baldwin	<p>Clarification is required as to the extent of the area proposed for allocation. The site boundary on Figure 4 of the Plan differs to that on Policy Maps found at Section 10 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Draft Policy 5 states that the total site area is 2.56ha, however, the site identified on the Policy Maps appears to be much greater in terms of site area.</p> <p>The draft Policy states that the site should deliver 2.06ha of market dwellings (equating to 72 new homes). The site will also then be required to deliver a car park and a retail use.</p> <p><b>Summary: Clarification is required regarding the extent of the site allocation area.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed retail use at the site is supported as it will further enhance the sustainability credentials of Eye by providing convenient access to shopping opportunities and create jobs for the local community.</b></p>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – the site area will be extended to include the land west of the factory buildings.
		AMP	The site is inappropriate for its current use but ideal for residential use due to its proximity to the centre of Eye.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Support the redevelopment of the Chicken Factory site as its current use is inappropriate and the site is well placed close to the Town centre for residential retail and parking.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	The redevelopment of the chicken factory is long overdue and I support the policy.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		Suffolk County Council	The following addition to explanatory text is proposed: <i>“The proposed development should support safe walking and cycling. FP12 runs though the site and could be upgraded to bridleway or cycle track status to facilitate cycling. Surface improvements to the full length should also be made, as parts of the path currently get very muddy.”</i>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – text proposed to be added.
	<b>Para 4.20</b>			
		Amber REI	Whilst we agree with some of paragraph 4.20, the wording of sentences 2 and 3 could be clearer. At current its wording insinuates that the site will be for Food Retail instead of Housing: <i>“In earlier consultations, residential development was</i>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – wording to be clarified.

			<i>proposed on the site. However, it has since been decided to allocate a site for a food retail outlet".</i> Though, there is evidentially potential for both housing and shopping facilities on the site, which is acknowledged in later parts of the NDP.	
	<b>Para 4.20, Para 5.4 and Supporting Document 14</b>			
		Amber REI	The proposal for 50 car parking spaces is not derived from any substantial assessment of parking need for the Town and is not therefore justified. Without proper assessment and the consequent absence of objective evidence to identify a specific need; the required provision also risks encouraging commuting by car and affecting the viability of the development objectives of retail and housing on the site.	<b>Comments noted</b> – it is not possible to quantify the number of additional public car parking spaces needed – it is a matter of judgement. The proposal to provide 85 public parking spaces on the land to the west of the factory building is welcome.
	<b>Para 4.21</b>			
		Amber REI	The proposals for retail should be supported by ‘operational car parking’ only and reference should also be made to the potential for overspill car parking on land to the west of the existing factory buildings.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – the policy should be revised to reflect the need for housing, retail with operational car parking and public car parking on the larger site.
	<b>Eye 5, 12 and 11</b>			
		Suffolk County Council	<i>Policy Eye 5 - Chicken Factory, Yaxley Road and Policy Eye 12 – Food retail, and Policy Eye 11 – Car Parking</i> These policies all relate to the development of the former Chicken Factory site. It might be clearer to combine these policies (or relevant part of the policy in case of Eye 11) into a single policy allocating the Chicken Factory and detailing the requirements of the site. Multiple policies covering one site could lead to confusion, where as a single policy would more succinctly explain a clear vision for the area.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – a single policy will be prepared for the Chicken Factory site.
	<b>Eye 6 – Paddock House Church Street Eye</b>			

		AMP	Support the retention of Green Space on the Church Street Frontage to Paddock House	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	A mixed tenure development is preferable to the affordable housing scheme proposed by the District Council. There should be a design competition to ensure a high quality development.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Could Paddock House be demolished before a decision is taken on its future.	<b>Comments noted</b> – this is a matter for MSDC and cannot be achieved through the ENP.
		AMP	It is most important that current area of green space is maintained as is retention of mature trees (particularly catalpa)	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Support residential development of Paddock House as long as open space and parking retained.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Support the development of Paddock House for homes but suggests the design should incorporate garages at ground floor level. Adding car parking spaces in front of Paddock House would not remove traffic congestion in Church Street.	<b>Comments noted</b> – the retention of car parking is not intended to reduce congestion.
		AMP	Fully support the proposals for Paddock House	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Draft Policy Eye 6 proposes to allocate the site for 12 dwellings of which 5 (41%) should be used affordable dwellings. It is noted that the AECOM Site Assessment and SHELAA assessed the site as having a capacity of 20 dwellings. The Housing Viability Assessment assessed the site based on a yield of 23 dwellings and found the scheme to be viable providing 35% or 22.4% affordable housing. The scheme was not tested at 41% affordable housing. It is noted that that the AECOM Site Assessment documents states that the site is in a Conservation Area and located within close proximity to multiple listed buildings. Built heritage constraints are not referenced in the draft Policy. <b>Summary: Clarification is required as to site capacity.</b>	<b>Comments noted</b> – the District Council proposal is for the whole site to be used for high density affordable housing which may be able to be provided with subsidy and without the District Council making a profit. However Eye prefers lower density mainly market housing on the site because this will enable higher design standards appropriate to the historic location.
		AMP	The Plan proposes the first properly assessed and planned use of the site preserving the green space and much needed parking spaces.	<b>Comments noted.</b>

		AMP	Challenge the logic of market housing for design reasons – if affordable is a priority why can't designs be appropriate for the Paddocks?	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – high quality design is considered to be more likely with lower density market housing.
		Suffolk County Council	An archaeological evaluation prior to planning application is not necessary for this site and it is recommended that the policy requires archaeological evaluation by condition.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – policy already refers to this.
		MSDC	The proposals for the Paddock House site do not reflect the District Council's emerging proposals for the site. We suggest an alternative policy should be drafted in consultation with the District Council following further discussion and consultation with residents.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the District Council is a developer as regards its role as owner of the Paddock House site. The planning system should be plan led and Neighbourhood Plans are intended to provide people with the opportunity to shape their own environment and place. Local people have made clear by a 3 to 1 majority that they wish the open space adjoining Church Street to be kept open. Eye also considers that market housing is more likely to enable higher quality design in this historic setting. MSDC should respect the views of local people and the plan making process. The trees growing on the open space are in a conservation area and have an added degree of protection.
	<b>Paras 4.27 – 4.30</b>			
		MSDC	The remains of Victoria windmill may be considered a non-designated heritage asset, although broadly a ruin.	<b>Comments noted</b> – it is not clear what change, if any, this comments seeks to be made to the Plan.
	<b>Eye 7 and 8 – Land at Victoria Mill Eye and Victoria Mill Allotments</b>			
		AMP	The Town Council should make the most of its assets – it should be possible to accommodate the allotment holders on another site and realise a substantial receipt for the Town.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Support as long as alternative allotments are provided.	<b>Comments noted</b> – the allotments could not be used for housing unless alternative allotments are provided

		MSDC	Say “ <i>is proposed for</i> ” rather than “ <i>should be developed for</i> ” in both policies	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend policy wording as suggested.
		AMP	I find it difficult to foresee any acceptable alternative allotments so my wife and I would be forced to cease cultivating a plot. Given some open space is desirable the area is enhanced in value rather than devalued as suggested in para 4.27. The extra 106 homes would worsen traffic congestion. Encourage use of allotments by new residents.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the existing allotments would only be developed for housing if alternative allotments that meet the tests set out in the ENP can be met including a 50% increase in plots and the Secretary of State gives permission to dispose. Substantial open space is already proposed in the 280 dwelling development surrounding the site. It is proposed that traffic management be addressed through a traffic management plan.
		AMP	<p>The proposition to develop the allotment land, including the ‘agricultural’ section is completely and quite unbelievable and contradictory to previous statements in the Plan regarding future housing in Eye. Whilst stating that future housing may be imposed by central government policy, probably correctly, the plan proposes adding a further 100 plus houses on the allotments (Dare I say it is a substantial increase over previous figures) as a planned act by the Town Council. Surely this cannot be reconciled with a further pressure on the infrastructure in Eye to be kept to a minimum. With the new housing currently planned on the airfield which is ludicrous putting more houses up will only add to the lack of infrastructure. I believe the Central government wouldn’t force you to use the allotments! These valuable assets would be sacrificed to more housing estates, more crowding in the Town centre and further pressure on road, medical and educational facilities. This would be at the expense of recreational green space, contributing to the well-being of citizens of Eye which will boost good health and reduce pressure on the NHS.</p> <p>Retaining the current allotments would provide an easily accessible asset for the new citizens of Eye very close to where most would be living. Demand and uptake of plots would subsequently rise.</p> <p>These policies are completely misconceived and should be removed from the plan. We do not need more houses in Eye.</p>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – it is not clear what the previous proposals comment is referring to. It is considered that additional housing will be required to meet Government housing requirements. The existing allotments would only be developed for housing if alternative allotments that meet the tests set out in the ENP can be met including a 50% increase in plots and permission is granted to dispose by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has already granted permission to dispose of the agricultural land. Substantial open space is already proposed in the 280 dwelling development surrounding the site. It is proposed that traffic management be addressed through a traffic management plan.
		AMP	The proposals for housing on the allotments is contradictory to other statements in the Plan. The Plan adds a further 106 houses (a substantial increase over and above previous figures). How can this be reconciled with pressure on infrastructure. Central Government wouldn’t demand the development of the allotments. These valuable assets would be sacrificed to more housing estates, more crowding in the Town Centre and more	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – it is not clear what the previous proposals comment is referring to. It is considered that additional housing will be required to meet Government housing requirements. The existing allotments would only be developed for housing if alternative allotments that meet the tests set out in the ENP can be met including a 50% increase in plots

			pressure on facilities. This would be at the expense of recreational facilities. Demand for allotments will increase as surrounding population increases. Proposals should be removed from the Plan. Improve the allotments and use the field as public open space such as a community woodland.	and permission is granted to dispose by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has already granted permission to dispose of the agricultural land. Substantial open space is already proposed in the 280 dwelling development surrounding the site. It is proposed that traffic management be addressed through a traffic management plan.
		AMP	ETC should have investigated past use of the sites before applying to the Secretary of State – there was an intention to avoid proper discussion. The information sent to the secretary of state was wrong and the letters have not been made public. The land referred to as agricultural has been and still is allotments. Town Council has woefully under promoted take up of allotments in recent years. There will be a large number of potential new users and the Town Council has been unable to find an alternative site. Retaining the allotments helps meet Government health and sustainability priorities. There is no indication of specific needs that the capital would be used for. The importance of the allotments has not been fully explored with the community. The allotments should be retained and promoted and the agricultural land managed to allow it to be used for allotments in the future.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – it is not clear what the previous proposals comment is referring to. It is considered that additional housing will be required to meet Government housing requirements. The existing allotments would only be developed for housing if alternative allotments that meet the tests set out in the ENP can be met including a 50% increase in plots and permission is granted to dispose by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has already granted permission to dispose of the agricultural land. Substantial open space is already proposed in the 280 dwelling development surrounding the site. It is proposed that traffic management be addressed through a traffic management plan.
		AMP	These sites are well placed for development and preferred to the other sites that would need to be identified to provide the necessary housing growth. The value and utility of the sites would be greatly diminished once the 265 houses are built.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	The allotments provide Local Green Spaces which will be necessary within a new housing development with tiny gardens. They help to reduce obesity and encourage a healthy lifestyle. I would like to know how the money gained by selling the	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – it is not clear what the previous proposals comment is referring to. It is considered that additional housing will be required to meet Government housing requirements. The existing allotments would only be developed for housing if

			<p>allotment land will be invested specifically to meet the Towns needs.</p> <p>The proposals are contrary to statements earlier in the Plan regarding future housing in eye. Whilst stating that housing requirements could be imposed by the Government the plan proposes a further 160 houses on the allotments a considerable increase on previous figures – a deliberate act by the Town Council. How can this be reconciled with the need to keep pressures on infrastructure to a minimum. Central Government would not force you to use the allotments at the expense of crowding in the Town Centre and recreational green space important for well-being. Improve the allotments to attract tenants. Use the agricultural land as community woodland until its needed for allotments in the future.</p>	<p>alternative allotments that meet the tests set out in the ENP can be met including a 50% increase in plots and permission is granted to dispose by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has already granted permission to dispose of the agricultural land. Substantial open space is already proposed in the 280 dwelling development surrounding the site. It is proposed that traffic management be addressed through a traffic management plan.</p>
		AMP	<p>Why use the two allotment sites? Why squash so many houses in when there is so much agricultural land which has already had archaeological investigation? There has been no such investigation on the allotment site?</p> <p>Focus on the Langton Green area and see if the new housing increases demand for allotments.</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – it is not clear what the previous proposals comment is referring to. It is considered that additional housing will be required to meet Government housing requirements. The existing allotments would only be developed for housing if alternative allotments that meet the tests set out in the ENP can be met including a 50% increase in plots and permission is granted to dispose by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has already granted permission to dispose of the agricultural land. Substantial open space is already proposed in the 280 dwelling development surrounding the site. It is proposed that traffic management be addressed through a traffic management plan.</p>
		AMP	<p>Oppose the development of both allotment sites – contradicts previous statements in the plan for future housing in Eye – sure Government would prefer agricultural land to be used rather</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – it is not clear what the previous proposals comment is referring to. It is considered that additional housing will be required to meet</p>

			<p>than allotments. Every time plan is updated there is more housing proposed which will put more pressure on infrastructure. Baldwin land developers think that allotments will be an asset to buyers of the new development. Keep the allotments – improved them, encourage new gardeners, improve paths for disabled and encourage school to use the spare land.</p>	<p>Government housing requirements. The existing allotments would only be developed for housing if alternative allotments that meet the tests set out in the ENP can be met including a 50% increase in plots and permission is granted to dispose by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has already granted permission to dispose of the agricultural land. Substantial open space is already proposed in the 280 dwelling development surrounding the site. It is proposed that traffic management be addressed through a traffic management plan.</p>
	<b>Eye 7 – Land at Victoria Mill</b>			
		T W Baldwin	<p>As noted in the AECOM Site Assessment document this site has no direct access to the highway network. Indeed, at present it is land-locked by the allotments, to the south, and agricultural fields to the north, east and west. Draft Policy Eye 7 states that the site should deliver 19 market dwellings and 15 (44%) affordable dwellings. We note that the Housing Viability Assessment tested a scheme of 38 dwellings and found viability to be marginal at 35% affordable provision. <b>Summary: At present, this is a highly constrained site as a site access cannot be achieved without other developments coming forward and facilitating a direct link to the highway network. Clarification is also required regarding site capacity and scheme viability.</b> The site was assigned an amber rating in the AECOM Site Assessment document.</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the layout of the surrounding 280 home site provides for access to the site. The site is owned by ETC which can accept lower profits than a private landowner if it wishes.</p>

		AMP	This site is an obvious site for housing development – the opportunity should not be wasted – there is already a planned development for the area surrounding the land.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		Suffolk County Council	It is welcome that the policy and paragraph 4.28 make reference to burial sites on the western edge of this site. It is recommended that the policy and explanatory text make explicit reference to “preservation in situ” to be completely clear about how developers should approach the archaeology on the site. It is recommended the policy is amended to read (added text in <i>italics</i> ): “Of the 1.24 hectare site about 0.2 hectares on the western side should not be developed to protect heritage assets <i>and preservation in situ will be required by condition</i> ”	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – change wording as proposed.
	<b>Eye 8 – Victoria Mill allotments</b>			
		T W Baldwin	Draft Policy Eye 8 states that any development should provide 15 affordable dwellings, 12 market dwellings and 45 sheltered housing homes (total 72 dwellings). The Housing Viability Assessment and AECOM Site Assessment document states that this site has a capacity of 39 dwellings. The Housing Viability Assessment found scheme viability to be marginal at both 35% and 22.4% affordable housing. The only existing link from the site to the local highway network appears to be via a track off Castleton Way which serves the allotments. The AECOM Site Assessment states no constraints regarding site access, however, we consider that a safe and robust access could only be delivered across Mr Baldwin’s land from the proposed development of 265 dwellings accessed from Castleton Way. Without the provision of allotments elsewhere in the town this site will not come forward for delivery. <b>Summary: At present, this is potentially a highly constrained site as it has not been demonstrated that a site access can be</b>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> - the layout of the surrounding 280 home site provides for access to the site. The site is owned by ETC which can accept lower profits than a private landowner if it wishes. The site can only be developed if alternative allotments are provided and permission to dispose is granted by the Secretary of State.

			<p>achieved without other developments coming forward and facilitating a direct link to the highway network.  <b>Clarification is also required regarding site capacity and scheme viability.</b>  <b>At present this site is not deliverable as an alternative location for allotments is yet to be agreed.</b>  <b>The site was assigned an amber rating in the AECOM Site Assessment document.</b></p>	
		Suffolk County Council	<p>The following addition to explanatory text is proposed: <i>“The site incorporates FP14 along its eastern boundary, and the development should support safe walking and cycling to local amenities and into the wider public rights of way network by including appropriate surfacing of the full length of the path, along with an upgrade in status to either bridleway or cycle track.”</i></p>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – add text into Table 6 Infrastructure requirements
		AMP	<p>I gather from the allotment holders I have spoken to that they are against any change of area for this facility it might well be able to improve access, but many of them have been there for many years, and it is unlikely that a new site would have the same level of improved soil structure as on the current site. Allotments are becoming increasingly popular as new houses have smaller gardens and more people find an allotment financially beneficial.</p>	<b>Comments noted</b> – alternative allotments would need to meet the conditions set out in the Plan and agreed by ETC. These include high quality land and a 50% increase in plots.
		AMP	<p>A second concern that I have relates to the potential development of the allotments. I should state that I currently hold an allotment behind Millfields, and am opposed to the proposal to relocate the allotments to make way for future housing. This is in part due to my concerns about excessive housing within the town. However a second reason for my opposition to changing allotment location is that the current allotments are located in a place where they are reasonably accessible to present users. They are also ideally situated for the</p>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> - alternative allotments would need to meet the conditions set out in the Plan and agreed by ETC. These include high quality land and a 50% increase in plots and accessibility to the Towns residents. The existing allotments could only be developed if a suitable alternative site is identified and if permission to dispose is granted by the Secretary of State.

			potential allotment using residents, who may occupy new homes to be built on the fields behind the Castleton way, Haygate and Gaye Crescent roads. Thirdly whilst I note what is said on page 56 of the proposals regarding the additional limited spaces potentially at the Rettery, there does not appear to be a definite alternative site proposed. Furthermore unlike other parts of the plan, there does there appear to be any evidence of research done into how great the need or uptake of allotment space may be in the future. Therefore I would personally find it impossible to support a plan which proposes the relocation of the allotments to make way for housing, whilst appearing to give only cursory thought to where a new allotment site might be, and little to no thought to future demand.	
	<b>Para 4.31/32 and Eye 9 – St Peter and St Paul Primary School</b>			
		AMP	Building is of historic interest and not suitable for housing. Would a new school be C of E?	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the school buildings, if they are not required as a school in the future, can be converted to residential use and the policy seeks to ensure that heritage assets are safeguarded. The governance of the School is not a matter for the ENP.
		MSDC	The Plan recognises that this is an aspirational policy. The redevelopment of this site is dependent on a decision being made about the future of the school. There is therefore no certainty that this site will come forward. It may be better to deal with this in lower case text rather than as a formal policy of the Plan. Removing the modern block to the rear of the Victorian school would likely make an enhancement to the heritage assets.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the policy is distinguished from other policies and expressed as a policy will help ensure that the heritage location is respected in any future development.  <b>Comments noted</b> – the policy is intended to emphasis the heritage importance of the site and

			However, given the sensitive nature of the site, in close proximity to two Grade I listed buildings, a scheduled ancient monument, Conservation Area and other listed buildings, there would be potential concern from a heritage perspective about redevelopment of this site	the need for sensitive development. Design guidance is also provided.
		AMP	Closure of the Primary School would be a very unpopular decision as it's a focus of the community.	<b>Comments noted</b> – in all of the options for Primary School provision – expand the existing school, develop an additional school or develop a new school - there would be a Primary School in the Town. The decision on how additional school places should be provided is not a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan.
		AMP	The current Primary School should be used for 3 – 7 year olds.	<b>Comments noted</b> - The decision on how additional school places should be provided is not a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan.
		AMP	Supports the retention of the current school and the development of a new school near Hartismere High. Wonders if there will be demand.	<b>Comments noted</b> - The decision on how additional school places should be provided is not a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan.
		AMP	Full support	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		T W Baldwin	<p>The Site Assessment document prepared by AECOM states that the availability of this site is unknown and, as such, the site cannot be listed as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. In light of these comments and the requirements of the NPPF regarding suitable and deliverable sites for housing we have significant concerns regarding the robustness of this proposed site allocation.</p> <p>The site is subject to significant built heritage constraints which could potentially fetter the future development of the site and/or reduce site capacity. The site is within Eye Conservation Area and adjacent to a number of Grade I, II and II* listed buildings. Paragraph 4.32 of the draft Plan states the school building should be considered a non-designated heritage asset. The site has not been the subject of a Viability Assessment.</p>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the fact that the site would only come forward if the school is moved as a whole to a new site is acknowledged by the description of the policy as an aspirational policy. Retaining it as a policy helps to ensure an appropriate development in its heritage setting.

			<p><b>Summary: This site is potentially unavailable according to the published evidence base documents.</b></p> <p><b>The site was assigned a red rating in the AECOM Site Assessment document.</b></p>	
		All Saints School Trust	<p>We are very disappointed that the plan authors failed to consult adequately with the trust and the school in the preparation of the draft plan. No discussion whatsoever took place with us about the proposal for a new school.</p> <p>We were not consulted on the suggestion that our existing school site might be used for housing. At the very least this is a discourtesy.</p> <p>Because of the lack of engagement with the school we think that significant changes need to be made to the parts of the plan that address education.</p> <p>In addition to responding to the points we make in this response we have invited the neighbourhood plan team to meet with us and work with us on proposals for primary education. We very much hope that they will respond positively to this invitation.</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – emails seeking views and meetings were sent to the Chair of Governors and the Head of Education at the Diocese. These were followed up with telephone conversations which covered all the relevant issues. The offers of meetings were not taken up. The Town Council has maintained a dialogue with the County Council which has the responsibility of planning for school places. A letter has been sent to the author of this objections providing these facts and a revised objection was subsequently submitted.</p> <p><b>Commented noted</b> – a meeting has been held with the Trust which runs the Primary School.</p>
		All Saints School Trust	<p>We <b>oppose</b> 4.31 and 4.32 and Aspirational Policy Eye 9 and <b>submit that these sections should be deleted from the plan completely.</b></p> <p>The reasons for this submission are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no realistic prospect of this land being available for development within the plan period.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED:</b></p> <p>The site could be developed within the Plan period if a decision is made to provide a new primary school on a new site – this is not a decision for the neighbourhood plan but the County Council whose responsibility it is to plan for school places with education providers supports the allocation of a reserve primary school site.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site owners have not indicated any intention to make the site available within the plan period</li> <li>• The suggestion that a new 420 place school would be built during the plan period is so unlikely that it ought not even to be suggested as “aspirational” – please see our further submission below on this point</li> <li>• A significant portion of the site is within the flood plain</li> <li>• A large portion of the site is within the curtilage of a listed building (the Guildhall)</li> <li>• No evidence has been produced that small 12 site development would be viable financially (The School Buildings are owned by a Buildings (a Trust) and the land by Suffolk CC).</li> </ul>	<p>The owners are the Diocese and the County Council and neither have objected.</p> <p>It is unclear at this stage how likely a new school is. The County Councils preference is to expand on the existing school site but it supports the allocation of a reserve site to provide an alternative option.</p> <p>The part of the site within the flood plan which is also designated a Local Green Space should not be built on and the capacity of the site has been calculated accordingly.</p> <p>Yes and one of the reasons why the Town Council prefer to have a policy for the current school site is to ensure that if development takes place its heritage location is protected.</p> <p>If the decision was taken to provide a completely new primary school on the alternative site it is important that the site is brought into an alternative use. The Viability Assessment indicates that residential development is viable.</p>
	<b>Para 4.33</b>			
		AMP	Windfall provision is supported but seems to high – 5 to 10 houses per year would seem about right.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – the windfall allowance is too high. Correct figures for permissions over the last 10 years have been obtained from the District Council which indicates the windfall allowance should be amended to 50% of 120 dwellings over the plan period
	<b>Policy 10 – Reserve Housing Site</b>			
		AMP	Support as long as the planned open space is provided	<b>Comments noted.</b>

		AMP	It would be beneficial to show phasing in relation to the infrastructure and other needs.	<b>Comments noted</b> – unfortunately the provision of infrastructure cannot be linked directly to levels of development in the Plan. The Infrastructure Plan will seek to achieve this.
		MSDC	Although the District Council has no issue with the identification of a reserve site you should be aware of the comments made in paras. 77 to 79 of the Examiner’s Report on the Debenham Neighbourhood Plan.	<b>Comments noted</b> – para 77 of the report referred to states that the Debenham policy does not make it clear if the site referred to is a reserve site or not. The wording of ENP policy eye 10 is very clear that it is a reserve site and the site is not referred to in Table 3 which summarises the housing allocations. Para 78/79 states that phasing is not appropriate. There is no phasing proposed in the ENP – policy eye 10 states that the site is a reserve site – it is not therefore phased but would need a revision to the plan to bring it forward and Table 4 gives expected phasing but makes not phasing requirements.
		Suffolk County Council	It is recommended that “Archaeological Assessment will be required at the evaluation stage” is changed to “Archaeological Assessment will be required <i>prior to the granting of planning permission.</i> ” This makes the policy clear about when the archaeological evaluation should take place.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – change wording as proposed.
		AMP	The allocation of land in Policy 10 seems sensible – should be used in preference to the allotments. The supporting text in the policy should however be stronger in terms of setting the design / standard / styles. The design brief for the adjoining land with its outline permission could be far better in terms of style, adherence to environmental needs including resource efficiency and setting	<b>Comments noted</b> - design guidance will be provided in a supporting document as a result of the work being undertaken by AECOM
		Occold Parish Council	Occold’s housing needs survey last year found that nearly 25% of people anticipating moving to alternative accommodation within the next 5 years, were looking to move to neighbouring parishes, (about 12 people). If this percentage is replicated across the “surrounding villages” – possibly wider – then the	<b>Comments noted</b> – the Plan makes provision for some affordable and sheltered housing needs from surrounding parishes. The overall housing allocations are far higher than needed to meet the needs of Eye alone. There is no information

			reserve building site may well be needed. If so, will this site include affordable housing and what percentage of homes will be affordable?	available on which to base specific allocations of affordable or sheltered housing needs for surrounding villages.
	<b>Paras 4.38 and 4.39</b>			
		AMP	Development period too long.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the development period needs to match the Local Plan period which is 2018 to 2036.

	<b>Section 5 – Other Land Use Proposals</b>			
	<b>Para 5.3b</b>			
		Amber REI	We object to the provision for car parking provision for the reasons mentioned above, however the opportunity remains to achieve this desire provision through the construction of the extant permission to the west of the factory buildings.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – the site area will be extended to include the land west of the existing factory.
	<b>Figure 9 – Potential Uses for The Rettery and Chicken Factory area</b>			
		Amber REI	Replace this figure with a plan showing the whole site as provided in the response.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend Figure 9 accordingly
	<b>Eye 11 – Car Parking</b>			
		AMP	Oppose the proposal for car parking in The Rettery – better kept as a green space and for walking and cycling. The proposal is contrary to the identification of the area as a Local Green Space.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – car parking can be included in this area while protecting important buildings, views, local green spaces and pedestrian/cycleway access with sensitive and appropriate design.
		MSDC	A car park at the Rettery would detract from the vegetated, semi-rural setting to the rear of Lambseth House (Grade II) and Chandos Lodge (Grade II), so would be inappropriate in this location. Reword to say “ <i>Land is allocated at .. for car parking for public use</i> ”	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – car parking can be included in this area while protecting important buildings, views, local green spaces and pedestrian/cycleway access with sensitive and appropriate design. <b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend policy wording as recommended.
		AMP	Support car parking on The Rettery. Suggest the land behind the Church Street Co-op is used to provide additional car parking by extending Buckshorn Lane car park.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	How would 60 car parking spaces be added to The Rettery – a double storey car park?	<b>Comments noted</b> – the provision of up to 60 spaces is possible at ground level as shown in Figure 10.

		AMP	Suggest the land behind the Church Street Co-op is used to provide additional car parking by extending Buckshorn Lane car park.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the views of the land owner on this proposal are unknown as are the views of MSDC which owns the car park.
		AMP	Full support for this much needed addition	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Parking on The Rettery would be contrary to the visual amenity and recreational value of the area. Access would not be safe. Better to have it in one place elsewhere such as east and west of the Pedestrian Way south of Pine Close.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – car parking can be included in this area while protecting important buildings, views, local green spaces and pedestrian/cycleway access with sensitive and appropriate design.
		AMP	There is currently insufficient car parking for shopping in Eye which often means that people go to Diss and local shops miss out. More parking is needed now and all new homes should have car parking.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	<b>Para 5.5 and Eye 11 – Car Parking</b>			
		AMP	The Plan identifies The Rettery as a Local Green Space and a Visually Important Open Space. Policy Eye 19 state that VIOS will be protected and development proposals must demonstrate they will not significantly affect the views of these spaces. VIOS also identified as local green spaces have an additional level of protection under Eye 20. The view from Lambseth Street is important because it conveys a sense of rural in the urban area. It has a medium to high risk of surface water flooding and a difficult entrance. There would be health and safety risks to cyclists and walkers because of manoeuvring cars. Its to far away from the shops for people to use. Support cycling a footpath route instead. <i>The other car park proposed for the Chicken Factory site would be preferable, on the grounds of (1) it would be making use of a brownfield site, and (2) it would be nearer the town centre if linked through to the Cross St car park.</i>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – car parking can be included in this area while protecting important buildings, views, local green spaces and pedestrian/cycleway access with sensitive and appropriate design.

	<b>Eye 11 Car Parking and para 5.4 and 5.6</b>			
		Amber REI	Object to requirement to provide car parking for surrounding residents which is not the landowners responsibility and the implication that 100 car parking spaces can be provided in para 5.6.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – para 5.6 refers to 50 car parking spaces. Amber REI have proposed an alternative location within the site for 83 spaces.
		AMP	Use of The Rettery for car parking will impact on Local Green Space, allotments, and be hazardous for the proposed cycleway and footpath. It is also a floodplain. Extending cross street car park requires two entrances/exits but don't link into The Rettery.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – car parking can be included in this area while protecting important buildings, views, local green spaces and pedestrian/cycleway access with sensitive and appropriate design. There is no proposal to join Cross Street Car Park with the Rettery for vehicular access.
	<b>Eye 12 – Food Retail</b>			
		AMP	Undecided whether a food retail outlet will benefit other retailers but open to the idea that it might. It will be beneficial to an ageing population.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Support the development of a new supermarket to complement the two existing ones	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		MSDC	Needs to be reworded to say “ <i>Land at ... is proposed for</i> ”	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend wording as suggested
		East of England Co-op	Should the proposed food outlet be located in central eye it is essential it is closely linked with the existing retail offer. A store fronting the Cross Street Car park and not Magdalan Street would be advised. Core pedestrian flow should be encouraged through Cross Street car park with hard landscaping drawing in the facilities of the public toilets and Library – a plan illustrating this is provided.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		Suffolk County Council	If this policy is to remain separate from Policy Eye 5 (see General Comments section) it is recommended that this policy should have the same archaeological requirements as policy Eye 5. Inclusion of the clause “Archaeological Assessment will be required prior to the granting of planning permission” is	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – ensure wording is included in the combined policy.

			recommended. This will make it clear that archaeological evaluation is required for the retail section of the site as well as the other parts of the site.	
		AMP	Concerned that a new supermarket would draw trade away from High Street traders and it would cause additional traffic in the Town Centre.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the Plan proposes a food retail outlet adjoining the Town centre because it is very likely that a new supermarket will be brought forward by the market to meet growth in population and its location adjoining the Town Centre is more likely increase trade for existing shops and supermarkets than a supermarket outside the Town. Increase traffic in the Town centre is a concern which is why a traffic management plan is proposed.
		Amber REI	The principle of Eye 12 (Food Retail) is supported. However, it would be more appropriate to identify this provision as ‘shopping and local services’, to further increase the schemes adaptability to dynamic market needs if necessary. We request that reference to 50 parking spaces is removed and replace with ‘car parking to serve the stores operational requirements’. It is also recommended that the reference to Policy Eye 30 is removed as the justification for Electric Vehicle Charging Points is not fully justified.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – it is not clear what local services are and the need is for food retailing.  <b>ACCEPTED</b> – revise policy to refer to a supermarket with operational car parking and public car parking.  <b>PARTIALLY ACCEPTED</b> - no percentages for EV charging points were proposed in Supporting Document 15 Amend policy to require a minimum 10% EV charging point provision in order to be in line with the Suffolk Parking Standard for the closest equivalent development use type, that being new build pubs/hotels/restaurants
		AMP	Yes, an additional supermarket to give a choice would be good although this would hopefully not be to the detriment of the existing ones. One of the pluses would be that people may prefer to shop locally than drive into Diss.	<b>Comments noted.</b>

		AMP	Concerned that a new foodstore would lead to the closure of the existing easily accessible existing supermarkets – would prefer a new shopping in vacant shops.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the Plan proposes a supermarket adjoining the Town centre because it is very likely that a new supermarket will be brought forward by the market to meet growth in population and its location adjoining the Town Centre is more likely increase trade for existing shops and supermarkets than a supermarket outside the Town. There are no vacant shops big enough to accommodate a supermarket.
		AMP	Full support for this much needed addition	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	The site is inappropriate for its current use but an ideal site for retail due to its proximity to the Town centre.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	Support the policy however due regard must be had to the impact of traffic flow from the development of a sizable retail outlet. Provision of car parking – 50 spaces is minimal – is only one aspect to be considered.	<b>Comments noted</b> – traffic generation is a concern which is why a traffic management plan is required.
		AMP	If this area has contamination risks why is it proposed for a food store?	<b>Comments noted</b> – any contamination will need to be cleared whatever type of development takes place on the site.
	<b>Eye 13 – Land West of Eye Cemetary, Yaxley Road.</b>			
		T W Baldwin	The land identified by Policy Eye 13 and Figure 11 is under the control of our client. As per our previous discussions with the Town Council our client supports the proposed allocation of this land for a crematorium.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	The provision of a Crematorium is positive and sensible forward planning as the population ages. The development should be sensitively screened.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – add further requirements for screening of the site from the West and North.
		AMP	Its madness to put a Crematorium close to the Town/School	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – emissions from crematorium are strictly controlled – see Process Guidance Note 5/2 (12) Statutory Guidance for Crematoria September 2012 Defra.

				<p>THE SITING AND PLANNING OF CREMATORIA – guidance issued by DOE 1978 states:</p> <p>'7. Efficiently operated modern cremators should not cause any nuisance or inconvenience to houses in the vicinity. But to allow for any possible emission of fumes, the direction of the prevailing wind should be taken into account in the selection of a site. 8. Main services should be available, water drainage electricity and gas. If main drainage is not available a simple treatment plant large enough to deal with soil drainage from the building may be acceptable. 9. Entrances and exits require careful planning; they should be from or to local distributor roads and appropriate sight lines should be provided. The highway authority, as well as the planning authority, should be consulted. It helps the circulation of traffic to have a separate entrance and exit. If the entrance and exit routes share the same roadway this should be about 5m wide. 10. The gateway at the entrance to the site should be set back enough to allow a full turn-in from the road for any vehicle before passing through the gates. A pedestrian gateway should be provided adjoining the vehicular gateway, as many visitors to the crematorium grounds and remembrance chapel may come at a time when the main building is closed.</p> <p>17. The Cremation Act 1902 (Section 5) provides that no crematorium shall be constructed nearer to any dwelling house than 200 yards (182.880m)*, except with the consent in writing of the owner, lessee and occupier of such house, nor within 50 yards (45.720m) of any public highway, nor in the consecrated part of a burial ground.'</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		AMP	Yes thankyou – why we have to do a 60 mile round trip to be cremated is beyond me – a well-designed park next to a renovated cemetery should be a benefit to the community and a priority.	<b>Comments noted</b> and the link to improving the cemetery Table 6 indicates that a contribution to the improvement of the cemetery should be required.
		AMP	Excellent idea	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	In addition, plans for a new crematorium (policy 13; 5.14) would be improved by linking the memorial grounds to the existing ‘Green’ burial site in the ETC cemetery to create a properly landscaped area in what is currently an unappealing field. Planting trees and shrubs, allowing a managed approach to the inclusion of memorial benches, and creating an environment for remembering loved ones and personal reflection would make the whole area more attractive, potentially more cost effective and encourage more people to consider it as an option for burial.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – the link to improving the cemetery is noted. Table 6 indicates that a contribution to the improvement of the cemetery – which would include the green cemetery - should be required.
		AMP	Although I support the idea of the provision of a crematorium in Eye or vicinity I have concerns about the site chosen. The land here rises above surrounding land and a new ‘industrial scale’ building with large car parking is likely to be intrusive in the landscape. It may be possible to consider sufficient planting screening to the west but it is unclear how its northern boundary could be changed sufficiently to protect views from Castleton Way/ Hartismere School southwards. It does create a western boundary that could lose the essence of a rural settlement tucked into the landscape. This development allocation should only be supported if detailed design can clearly demonstrate such change will not materially impact on the rural nature of this western edge of the settlement and there is sufficient mitigation of the highest quality to allow it to go ahead..	<b>ACCEPTED IN PART</b> – the site adjoining the cemetery is the most appropriate for this use and the land to the east of the cemetery cannot be used for archaeology reasons. However revise the policy to refer to the scale of the building and screening to minimise the impact on the views referred to.
		AMP	Excellent idea – Suffolk is not well served when it comes to crematoria. I would welcome the development of this area for	<b>Comments noted.</b>

			this purpose – it will be necessary to improve the cemetery which is in a poor state.	
		Suffolk County Council	The following addition to explanatory text is proposed: <i>“FP8 and FP42 would provide pedestrian, and potentially cycle, access to the site, therefore appropriate surface improvements to the paths, along with a possible upgrade in status to either bridleway or cycle track should be considered as part of the improvements and additions to the site.”</i>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – text to be added to Table 6 Eye 7..
		AMP	Strongly support new crematorium for Eye, for the reasons outlined in para 5.11 – 14, particularly a reduction in need to travel and the stress for the bereaved.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	<b>Eye 14 – Land for Primary School, West of Hartismere High School.</b>			
		T W Baldwin	In principle, our client supports the need to ensure that the capacity of education infrastructure in the town increases to respond to and support housing growth. The location of the proposed ‘reserve site for a primary school’ adjacent to Hartismere High School is a logical location for any new primary school, should the need for a new facility arise. The identified ‘reserve site’ at Figure 12 of the draft Plan differs in area to the ‘reserve site’ identified on the Policy Plan at the rear of the draft Plan. Regardless of the exact extent of the proposed ‘reserve site’ it falls within land currently under the control of our client. The principle of safeguarding land in this location for education purposes is not a proposal our client is, in principle, opposed to, however, as per our 2017 SHELAA submission, our client is primarily promoting the land south of Castleton Road (including the proposed allocation area) for residential development.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – ensure Figure 12 and the policies plan are consistent.  <b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the site and the surrounding land is not proposed for housing development – the development of all of the land proposed by Mr Baldwin would be massive over development of the Town.

			To support the aims and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan moving forward our client would be keen to discuss the proposed reserve site allocation and the surrounding land promoted for residential development with the Town Council.	
		AMP	Support the allocation of a site for a Primary School off Castleton Way.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	At the moment the primary school works very well pupil size wise but obviously with the imminence of a growing population (re new houses) it seems to me that a new school would be necessary. The idea that the Church of England reinvesting in a new one sounds ideal.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		MSDC	This is a matter on which Suffolk County Council should be consulted and the Neighbourhood Plan should have regard to their comments.	<b>Comments noted</b> – Suffolk County Council have been consulted and supports the allocation.
		Suffolk County Council	<p>There is currently one early years setting operating in Eye the need for an additional early years setting is acknowledged within the plan, however there are some issues with only providing the option for the setting within the allocated school site.</p> <p>SCC usually do encourage early years settings to be located with primary schools where possible and it is sensible that this option is available. However, in this case, as there isn't guarantee that the school can come forward due to funding, this would not be the best location for an early years setting to come forward on its own.</p> <p>It is recommended that another option is included in the plan, should the early years facility need to come forward on its own. This would require 915.2m2 of land and safe, and sustainable routes to access the site.</p> <p>If co-location with the school is not possible other suitable locations for an early years setting SCC would encourage are:</p>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – include a reference in the infrastructure section and add to the Infrastructure Plan in due course..

			<p>co-location with community facilities (such as a community centre or health facility), within town centres, or within other well connected mixed use areas (such as the Plan's vision for the Rettery and Chicken Factory area). These locations tend to be well connected and are services that local people need to access, so a setting in one of these locations would be convenient for users and would help to make the early years setting more viable (as early years provision is delivered by the market).</p> <p>Including settings as part of new development is also a potential option, as new development tends to be where young children arise. The plan could include an early years settings as part of one of its housing allocations.</p>	
		Suffolk County Council	<p>It is recommended that "Archaeological Assessment will be required at the at the start of the detailed planning process" is changed to "Archaeological Assessment will be required <i>prior to the granting of planning permission.</i>" This makes the policy clear about when the archaeological evaluation should take place.</p>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – wording to be changed.
		Suffolk County Council	<p>Eye is served by the 210 place St Peters and St Pauls Primary School. There is a project to expand this school to 315 places and a masterplan up to 420, which would enable the school to accommodate the growth proposed in the neighbourhood plan. The allocation of a potential school site in the plan is welcome. Paragraph 5.20 is correct, in that funding is not currently available to relocate the current primary school facilities in Eye. However, the allocation does provide options SCC can discuss with the school and the Diocese should the situation change.</p>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		Suffolk County Council	<p>The following addition to explanatory text is proposed:  <i>"Opportunities shall be sought for safe cycling and walking links to the existing and any future proposed school sites."</i></p>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – additional text to be incorporated.
		AMP	Full support	<b>Comments noted.</b>

		AMP	<p>I do not believe the current primary school site can be developed sufficiently to meet future demand without intolerable impacts on the centre of Town. Traffic congestion is already of concern and to see a doubling of pupils can only suggest traffic will create unsolvable problems.</p> <p>The setting of the current school in an important heritage zone would require development of the very highest standard and the loss of open spaces for the children's education and health would also be unsuitable.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b> and the need for the highest standard of development should St Peter and St Paul school be replaced agreed.</p>
		Occuld Parish Council	<p>It states on the NP that St Peter &amp; St Paul primary school is currently fully subscribed with 210 places but that a plan has been prepared to increase capacity to 420 places. Has this plan been discussed with the school since it joined All Saints Multi Academy Trust last year? If not, we would suggest that contact is made with the school / MAT to ensure that the plan remains coincident with the trust's future plans and, if changes are necessary, a revised plan be prepared.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b> - Emails seeking views and meetings were sent to the Chair of Governors and the Head of Education at the Diocese. These were followed up with telephone conversations which covered all the relevant issues. The offers of meeting were not taken up. The County Council is responsible for planning school places, it has been engaged on this issue during the Plan process and it supports the land allocation.</p>
	<b>Para 5.15 – 5.21 Eye 14 – Land for Primary School</b>			
		All Saints School Trust	<p>We <b>oppose</b> 5.15 – 5.21 and Policy Eye 14 and <b>submit that these sections should be deleted from the plan completely.</b></p> <p>The reasons for this submission are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Even if all the housing is built within the plan period and the estimated additional pupils places based on the yield of 0.25 pupils per dwelling is correct these places can all be provided by expanding the existing school.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – The allocation of a site simply provides the option to provide a second or replacement school. Its allocation is supported by Suffolk County Council which has responsibility for planning for school places.</p> <p>It is not yet clear whether the existing school can be expanded to accommodate all of the needs – currently plans for a 315 place school seem feasible while expansion to 420 is uncertain. The need for Primary and Early Years places arising from the proposals in this plan together is much higher than</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.15 itself accepts that <i>the expansion of the school on its current site is the most cost effective option to provide additional school places for primary school children...</i></li>   <li>• The yield of 0.25 children per new dwelling is unlikely to be accurate in a rural market town such as Eye. Experience in rural areas shows that many new dwellings tend to be purchased by older inhabitants without primary aged children and whilst these figures are useful for planning purposes we would expect the yield in reality to be substantially lower.</li>   <li>• Building a new 210 place school within this plan period would in our view be extremely damaging to primary education in Eye and surrounding villages. This would almost certainly lead to two schools with significant unfilled places making them harder to run and less viable. The impact could even lead to the closure of smaller schools outside Eye causing significant harm to these communities. We submit strongly that the suggestion of an additional school in the Town in this plan period should be removed entirely from the plan.</li>   <li>• 5.17 suggests that that expansion of the existing site “would be short term” but we would challenge this assertion. Allowing the existing school to expand to 420 pupils (which is the size of an average primary school with two forms of entry) would leave</li> </ul>	<p>the maximum 420 places the existing school can be expanded to and separate Early Years provision would need to be made in another location.</p> <p>It is understood that the County Council’s preference is to expand the existing school. However it is also understood that expanding the school from 315 places to 420 places could be expensive.</p> <p>The Plan relies on the calculations of the County Council which is responsible for planning school places. The Plan makes substantial provision for affordable housing for younger households which are likely to have more children and the calculations exclude provision for older people.</p> <p>Decisions on whether the existing school should be expanded, an additional 210 place school provided or a completely new 420 place school provided are not for the neighbourhood plan to make.</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – as above this is not a decision for the neighbourhood plan and this reference should be removed. Similarly Para 5.16 refers to concerns about the quality of education if the existing school</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>the town with a much more sustainable and viable school that could operate well beyond the timeframe after the plan.</p> <p>. If as 5.17 suggests the expanded 420 place school really is nearly full after the plan period ends then any future plan for expansion of the town would need to take this into account but at this stage this is purely speculation. We do not know if all these houses will actually be built how many primary aged children they would produce. In any event perhaps the most likely outcome after 2036 would be to suggest that a new primary school (in addition to the existing school) would be needed if future development on scale is desirable. This would mean the investment is not, as suggested, short term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are disappointed that one of the main reasons for the proposals around primary education appears to be related to road congestion around school start and finish times. Something that is true for almost every single school in the country. It is even more perplexing that the suggested solution to this is to move the school next to Hartismere High School on another road that is already extremely congested. It is unclear to us how this solves this problem.</li> <li>• It appears likely that the additional development envisaged by the plan is likely to further increase traffic near to the High School. Traffic is also likely to be increased due to a recent decision by Suffolk County Council to significantly cut funding for home to school (bus) transport. This change is very likely to mean more children are driven to Hartismere High School by car than at present.</li> <li>• We would also challenge the assertion that “modern facilities” would make a significant improvement on two</li> </ul>	<p>is expanded. These judgements are not a matter for the ENP and will be deleted.</p> <p><b>Comments noted</b> – based on the County Council’s pupils per household ratio’s the housing provision in the Plan will mean most of the capacity of a 420 place school will be taken up by the end of the Plan period for Primary aged children and more if Early Years is taken into account.</p> <p><b>Comments noted</b> - The Trust has explained that as part of the proposals to increase the capacity of the existing School improvements to car parking and drop off arrangements are being investigated and a reference to this should be added to the text. There is more space to provide car parking and drop off provision off road for the reserve site near Hartismere school.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>grounds. Firstly that the school already has (and certainly will have if expanded) modern facilities including a MUGA games field. Secondly there is no evidence “modern facilities” improves educational outcomes. We would certainly agree that schools should be well maintained and adequately equipped but it is the quality of staff and teaching that makes the most difference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The figures in 5.18 are incomplete and it is notable that there is no figure given for expanding the existing site.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan contains no suggestion whatsoever on where the substantial amounts of money (up to £7 million plus) to build a new school would actually come from, indeed in 5.20 you state that <i>the County Council has indicated that it currently considers a new school is not financially viable</i>. We agree with the County Council.</li> <li>• Whilst sharing facilities with High Schools can be advantageous to primary schools this is not as straightforward as it sounds. A simple example is that a full sized football pitch is not suitable for small primary aged children. The purchase of a mini-bus could easily enable the primary children at the existing school to take advantage of any expanded facilities at Hartismere and would be significantly cheaper than building a new school.</li> </ul> <p>We suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The section on primary education is re-written to make it clear that expansion of the existing school is the most pragmatic solution for the demand envisaged during this plan period.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – this is not a judgement for the neighbourhood plan and comments about educational provision will be removed from the text. Reference to the potential for sharing of facilities should be retained.</p> <p><b>Comment noted</b> – the County Council do not yet have fully worked plans for the work required to the existing school to increase its capacity – which is part of the doubts that exist about this option.</p> <p><b>Comments noted</b> – funding is not a matter for the neighbourhood plan but the Town Council will wish to represent the interests of the Town in securing funding for all necessary infrastructure improvements including schooling and this will be part of the Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p><b>Comments noted</b> – see above</p> <p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the decision on whether the existing school should be expanded, an additional school provided or a completely new school provided is for the neighbourhood plan to take. The</p>
--	--	---	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landowners near to the existing primary school site are approached and asked if they might make available a suitable site for parking to help alleviate traffic issues. Any suitable site could be included as an “aspirational” policy within the plan.</li> </ul>	<p>County Council supports a reserve site to provide it with options.</p> <p><b>Comments noted</b> – the plan has identified parking and traffic issues as a problem and the fact that the Trust also considers it a problem that needs to be resolved is welcome.</p>
	<b>Para 5.22</b>			
		AMP	I do not support the use of the spare allotment land here as a replacement for the Victoria allotments. The continued use of the land here as allotments would be welcome but as additional and alternative provision	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – remove reference to the potential for allotments at The Rettery.
		AMP	Supporting Document 11 identifies the number of allotments required if the current allotments are developed. The only solution proposed for these is the unused land at the private allotments at The Rettery – this space is not big enough and the grassed land is too poor for allotments.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> — remove reference to the potential for allotments at The Rettery.
	<b>Eye 15 – Sports Hall</b>	AMP	Full support much needed asset	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		AMP	<p>Eye is not well served in relation to Sports Facilities and this should be addressed as a matter of urgency. Exercise and the facilities to enable people to do exercise is vital for our communities health. Such facilities should be on our doorstep.</p> <p>The area around the Community centre should be developed further to include a leisure centre, swimming pool and gym.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p> <p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the development of leisure facilities with dual school and public use is the most practical and cost effective means to secure additional facilities.</p>
		Suffolk County Council	This policy should include the clause “ <i>Archaeological investigation on this site will be required by condition</i> ”. Some archaeological investigation has taken place on the area covered by the car park, so investigation by condition will be suitable for this site.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – wording to be amended accordingly.

--	--	--	--	--

	<b>Section 6 – Safeguarding and Development Control</b>			
		Natural England	Has no comments on the plan but refers to guidance about the natural environment.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	<b>Eye 16 - Development outside the Settlement Boundary</b>			
		Suffolk County Council	Archaeology is still a consideration to development outside of the settlement boundary. It is recommended that the following clause is added to the policy: <i>“Archaeological investigations must be undertaken prior to any planning application if there is a reasonable likelihood of significant archaeological remains being found on or adjacent to the site.”</i>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – the proposed clause to be added to the policy.
		MSDC	Recent appeal decisions have called into question this type of policy as they have been held to be inconsistent with the July 2018 National Planning Policy Framework. See para. 92 of appeal decision at Green Road, Woolpit reference App/W3520/W/18/3194926. It may be better to say that the settlement boundary identifies the area required for Eye to meet its full housing requirement. Further development beyond the boundary is not required and will be resisted.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – text to be amended accordingly.
		T W Baldwin	The development at Land south of Eye Airfield (Policy Eye 3) benefits from an outline planning approval, as such, this is a committed development which will come forward shortly. To reflect that this development is committed and subject to a	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – the settlement boundary should include all sites proposed for development including the Land south of Eye Airfield.

			planning approval the site area should be included within the Settlement Boundary on the Policy Plan which accompanies the Neighbourhood Plan. It is requested that this amendment to the Plan is made prior to its submission.	
		Gladman Developments Ltd	The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the NPPF. This policy should be drafted more flexibly with demonstrably sustainable development adjacent to the settlement boundary also supported.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – in a plan led system sites are identified and a settlement boundary defined.
	<b>Eye 16 - 20</b>			
		AMP	Full support – open spaces must be protected to ensure quality of life in the future	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	<b>Para 6.3 and Eye 17 – Development within the settlement boundary</b>			
		Historic England	We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, and are pleased to see that it considers the built and historic environments of Eye. However, we regret that we are unable to provide detailed comments at this time. We would refer you to our detailed guidance on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: < <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/</a> >.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		Suffolk County Council	SCC welcomes that archaeology has been well considered throughout the plan, particularly in the site policies.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – add text as proposed.

			<p>It is recommended that the following text is added to paragraph 6.3 in order to highlight where archaeological information can be accessed and encourage early engagement with the Archaeological Service:</p> <p><i>“The Suffolk Historic Environment Record and Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service should be consulted at the earliest opportunity for advice on the likely impacts of planning applications on archaeological heritage.”</i></p>	
		AMP	<p>I support the proposals in this policy but feel there should also be reference to very high standards of build to avoid adverse environmental impacts.</p> <p>Additional wording that identifies the need to meet high environmental standards that will allow properties to last including energy and water efficiency [considering how water stressed Suffolk is], net gain for biodiversity and respect for local distinctiveness. It should also relate to low carbon needs for transport and waste management.</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – not enough work has yet been undertaken to provide the evidence to justify additional policy requirements covering these issues. Advice could be added in the form of a supporting document in due course.</p>
		MSDC	<p>This seems to be the only policy covering heritage but is called <i>“Development within the Settlement Boundary.”</i> Perhaps this should be renamed to give greater emphasis to the protection of all heritage assets, or create a separate policy, so that there is one that deals with <i>“development within the settlement boundary”</i> and one that deals with <i>“Heritage Assets.”</i></p> <p>Additionally, point d. refers only to designated heritage assets: an additional point could be added to consider non-designated heritage assets, e.g. buildings of local interest.</p> <p>Not sure what <i>“island”</i> in line 2 means.</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the heritage of Eye needs to be considered regarding planning proposals anywhere in the Town not just in the conservation area and therefore a single policy is the best approach. Explanation in para 6.3 to be expanded.</p>
		AMP	<p>Is there uncertainty about the relationship between the conservation zone and the settlement boundary. Is heritage concern restricted to the conservation zone or does it stretch as it should, to the designated area shown on the map on page 16?</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b> - the heritage of Eye needs to be considered regarding planning proposals anywhere in the Town not just in the conservation area and therefore a single policy covers development in the settlement boundary. Explanation in para 6.3 to be expanded.</p>

			<p>Is the old railway station house no longer heritage? Conserve it. Investigate heritage of Rapsy Tapsy Lane.</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the station house is not listed but its future can be considered at the detailed planning stage. <b>Comments noted</b></p>
		Suffolk County Council	<p>Use of SCC flood maps and reference to flood risk within policy Eye 17 is welcome, however the current policy does not address flooding from all sources. Recognition should be given to fluvial flooding (flooding from rivers and the sea) and pluvial flood risk (surface water flooding). It is recommended the policy text is amended to: “Proposals should take account of flood risk from all sources, including fluvial flood risk and pluvial flood risk. Development should not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.” It would be helpful if the plan signposted to the appropriate national policy (paragraphs 155 and 161 of the NPPF) local policy (Policy CS4 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy), and the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy. This will provide wider context to flood risk in the parish.</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend policy and text as suggested</p>
		Environment Agency	<p>We note the Plan includes a constraints plan highlighting the extent of flood zones in the parish. We consider the Plan would benefit further from a separate section detailing flood risk and prevention measures in policies in more detail. Whilst the majority of the parish and site allocation policies are located in Flood Zone 1, there are also significant areas of Zones 2 and 3 within the parish boundary. The River Dove, designated a ‘main river’ flows through the centre of the parish and we maintain assets on the river. Sequential Approach The sequential approach should be applied within specific sites in order to direct development to the areas of lowest flood risk. If it is not possible to locate all of the development in Flood Zone 1, then the most vulnerable elements of the development should be located in the lowest risk parts of the site. If the</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – expand the reference to flooding in Policy 17 and supporting text.</p>

			whole site is at high risk (Flood Zone 3), a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) should assess the flood characteristics across the site and direct development towards those areas where the risk is lowest.	
	<b>Para 6.4 - Design</b>			
		AMP	There should be more on the detailed design of houses – a design guide with do’s and don’ts for developers.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – design guidance being developed with AECOM and will be provided as a supporting document
		AMP	More guidance on design required.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – design guidance being developed with AECOM and will be provided as a supporting document
		Suffolk Constabulary	<p>On Page 3 perhaps the vision could include “A Safe Town”. It is a well known fact that a safe environment promotes economic growth and a sense of community. This is well documented by “Secured by Design” <a href="http://www.securedbydesign.com/">http://www.securedbydesign.com/</a></p> <p>Additionally CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) is a process we use to ensure that our communities are safe for the future.</p> <p>I would suggest that all new build developments take account of the Principles of Designing out Crime in line with the attached Residential Design Guide. I would also suggest that developers be asked to apply for Secured by Design Accreditation. This can reduce the likelihood of break ins by a significant amount (some say 70%)</p>	<b>Comments noted</b> – and forwarded to AECOM to take into account in the design guidance work.
	<b>Para 6.18</b>			
		AMP	I wonder if the shopping district boundary should be extended along Magdalen Street to incorporate the former French’s garage (currently PaC2000) and the current pizza house as they are both currently commercial properties and could be suitable sites.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the ENP has accepted without review the boundary proposed by MSDC in its Local Plan Consultation document August 2017. It would be not be appropriate to amend this boundary

				without a full review which would then require further consultation.
	<b>Eye 18 and 19 – Area of Landscape Character and Visually Important Open Spaces</b>			
		Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>It is not clear what is the 'Eye Area of Special Landscape Value'. If this is to mean the Special Landscape Area its in the local plan and therefore unnecessary.</p> <p>What the visually important open spaces area considered to be should be defined on the policies map to enable a decision maker to apply the policy consistently. Identified views must ensure that they demonstrate a physical attribute elevating the views importance beyond simply being a nice view in open countryside.</p>	<p><b>PARTIALLY ACCEPTED</b> – amend wording to refer to the current Special Landscape Area (SLA) as defined in MSDC adopted Local Plan, but retain in the Plan as it's unknown if the designation will be retained in the new Joint Local Plan.</p> <p>Provide revised policy wording and provide more detail in a new Supporting Document 26 - Eye Special Landscape Area to describe the character and special qualities associated with area. The aim of the SLA designation is to retain, enhance and restore the distinctive and sensitive landscape and settlement character of the designated area. In particular strengthening the wooded valley meadowlands and fens landscape with appropriate planting and sympathetic management of the landscape features.</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – define the VIOS areas on the policies map.</p>
		Suffolk County Council	<p>Landscape policies Eye 18 and Eye 19 seek to address a number of landscape issues, however there is a lack of clarity and definition of certain terms in the policies which make the policies ineffective.</p> <p>Policy Eye 18 protects "the Eye Area of Landscape Value", however this is not defined on policies maps or within the text of the plan. The policy is also overly restrictive and could be</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – define policy on the policies map and in the text and revise policy wording as suggested.</p> <p>Revise text and policy wording for VIOS, SLA and add a policy for Managing change in the landscape as supported by viewpoints in SD 17.</p>

			<p>worded more positively. Wording is provided below as an example:  “Development proposals will be supported where they avoid significant detrimental impact on the landscape”  Wording could also encourage development to have a positive impact on landscape “Development proposals will be supported where they improve landscape condition and visual amenity where existing development has adverse effects.”  Any terms, such as “the Eye Area of Landscape Value” must be defined within the plan, and the evidence needs to provide justification, by explaining why the features the plan aims to protect are important, in order for the policies to be useful in making planning decisions  Policy Eye 19 protects visually important open spaces. While it is understood that this is saving a policy from the Mid Suffolk Local Plan, the Neighbourhood Plan should still provide a definition of what these are on the policies maps and explain why they are important, particularly as the Mid Suffolk and Babergh Joint Local Plan may supersede these saved policies. Providing this definition will ensure that the policy remains effective. It is noted that visually important open spaces were included in the Concept Plan for Eye, however these have not been carried through to the policies maps in the plan.</p> <p>Additionally, the explanatory text to Policy Eye 19 makes reference to Supporting document 17, which outlines viewpoints and how they are sensitive to development, but no protection of these views is brought into policy.  SCC would be happy to comment on any further iterations of the policy.</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend to refer to Special Landscape Area as defined in the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – define on the policies plan and add explanation to the text.</p> <p>Supporting document 17 Landscape and Visual Assessment, identifies key viewpoints into and out of the Town and provides an assessment of their sensitivity to change. e. These views define the rural character of settlement and demonstrate the importance of landscaping to suitably blend the edge of the town into the rural hinterland, thereby sustaining the rural nature of the town.</p>
<b>Para 10</b>				

		MSDC	State that the Plan supersedes Mid Suffolk District Council Local Plan policy SB3 and incorporate the wording of this policy in the Neighbourhood Plan.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the policy is in parallel to the Local Plan
	<b>Eye 18 – Area of Landscape Character</b>			
		MSDC	Where is the Area of Landscape Character / Value been identified? See Inspector’s comments on the Lawshall Neighbourhood Plan and the suggestion for a Policy on Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity: ‘The policy itself is clearly worded and largely resembles LP Policy CR04 with one subtle, but important difference that requires a modification to ensure the policy has sufficient flexibility and takes account of national policy. ! Retitle the policy and change all references to “Special Landscape Area” within the policy, its supporting text, Proposals Map and anywhere else in the Plan to “Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity” Change the phrase “protect and enhance” in the first bullet point of the policy to “protect or enhance’	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – define on the proposals map and explain in the text – see changes proposed above.
	<b>Eye 19 – Visually Important Open Spaces</b>			
		MSDC	Visually Important Open Spaces should be identified on the Policies Map. There is no need for the double designation set out in the last sentence. They should be one thing or the other.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – identify visual open spaces on the policies map.
	<b>Eye 20 – Local Green Spaces</b>			
		AMP	Objects strongly to the designation of her land as a Local Green Space and wants it to be removed.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – this land is considered to be appropriately identified as LGS.

		MSDC	The District Council objects to the designation of the Paddock House Roadside Meadow as a Local Green Space. See covering letter	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – 75% of residents of the surrounding roads and 75% of the residents of the Town as a whole support the retention of this open space.
		T W Baldwin	<p>The Policy Maps contained within the draft Plan identifies two Baldwin / Airfield County Park allocations and orchard for delivery at sites G20, G23 and G27. All of these proposed allocations fall within land being promoted for residential development by our client, indeed, designation G23 falls within the proposed ‘reserve site’ for housing south of Eye Airfield. At present, the draft Neighbourhood Plan does not provide any guidance or policies to shape these proposed allocations, nor does it set out how Country Park G27 and Langton Orchard will be delivered. Indeed, we note that Supporting Document 12 – Local Green Spaces Assessment, which supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan, does not assess the proposed allocations or the value of the land in its current form.</p> <p>To date these proposals have not been discussed with our client as the landowner, therefore we are unable to support the proposed allocations/designations.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the approved development at Land south of Eye Airfield will provide a significant amount of high quality public open space. In addition, any residential development at the ‘reserve site south of Eye Airfield’ and on the rest of the land promoted by our client would be required to deliver additional public open space.</p> <p>In light of the above it is suggested that in order to deliver a provision of public open space at G20, G23 and G27 housing growth will need to be allocated at these locations. Again, given the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan we would welcome the opportunity to discuss these designations with the Town Council.</p>	<b>PARTIALLY ACCEPTED</b> – G23 is wrongly located in Figure 15 and should be relocated in accord with the design brief.
		AMP	Local Green Spaces are important to the well-being of us all	<b>Comments noted.</b>

	Environment Agency	<p>Studies have shown that natural capital assets such as green corridors and green amenity spaces are important in climate change adaptation, flood risk management, increasing biodiversity and for human health and well-being. An overarching strategic framework should be followed to ensure that existing amenities are retained as well as enhancements made and new assets created wherever possible.</p> <p>We are pleased to see within Section 6: Safeguarding and Development Control of the Plan Draft, Policy Eye 20 – Local Green Spaces. The designation of ‘local green spaces’ is an important method of protecting natural capital assets. We recommend the protection of these spaces, and encourage enhancements to be made to them to help support biodiversity and varied habitats that will help improve the ecological footprint of any development locations in the parish.</p> <p>Enhancement to existing habitats should where possible feature within any conservation plans in development, and the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 170, sub-section d) states planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: ‘minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures’.</p> <p>Development management will guide the provision of green infrastructure which should be delivered in a collaborative approach between developers, councilors and the local community. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are often part of building green infrastructure into design. For more information please visit <a href="https://www.susdrain.org/delivering-suds/using-suds/background/sustainable-drainage.html">https://www.susdrain.org/delivering-suds/using-suds/background/sustainable-drainage.html</a>.</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – a new policy on biodiversity proposed: <b>NEW POLICY EYE AA – BIODIVERSITY NETWORKS</b>  <i>Retain and enhance habitats and improve ecological connectivity to create biodiversity networks with the surrounding landscape. All development needs to deliver measurable, proportionate and appropriate Biodiversity Net Gain.</i></p>
	AMP	Support the protection of Local Green Spaces which are precious	<b>Comments noted.</b>

		AMP	In the final document the mapping of local green space 23 needs to be checked. I believe this is intended to refer to the open space identified in the outline permission of the development on the south of the airfield. As this is confirmed or refined during the reserved matters determination this should then be mapped accordingly.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – move space 23 to the right location in accord with the design brief.
		All Saints Schools Trust	<p>Policy Eye 20 – Local Green Spaces We <b>oppose</b> the designation of “primary school playing field” as local green space. The reasons we oppose this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School playing fields are private land without public access</li> <li>• It is possible part of this land may be needed to expand the capacity of the school</li> <li>• There is already adequate protection of school playing fields as consent is required from the Secretary of State for Education for any disposal or change of use of a site (please see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/protection-of-school-playing-fields-and-public-land-advice">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/protection-of-school-playing-fields-and-public-land-advice</a> )</li> </ul> <p>Although we have suggested that Aspirational Policy Eye 9 is deleted we should point out that as things stand Figure 7 shows a map of the whole of the primary school site (including the playing fields) that it suggests could be used for housing. The map on page 69 (part of Figure 15) shows part of this site as proposed local green space. This appears to be inconsistent. We also note that the government guidance on the designation of local green spaces that can be found at <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space</a> states <i>The qualifying body (in the case of neighbourhood plan making) should contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space. Landowners will have opportunities to make</i></p>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> - the ownership of local green spaces is not relevant to their allocation. They are designated to shape development to ensure green spaces are protected. No change of use is proposed. The local green space area should be protected in any future development scheme. The landowner is the County Council and it has not objected. The Trust was approached for meetings to discuss proposals in the Plan but declined the opportunity (August 2018).

			<i>representations in respect of proposals in a draft plan. As we have a long (125 year) leasehold interest in this land we would have expected to have been consulted about this proposal</i>	
		Gladman Developments Ltd	Quotes from para 76 and 77 of the NPPF which sets out the role of communities in seeking to designate land as local green spaces which makes it clear that they should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development in the wider area and sets out some tests which must be met. Gladman has not been able to find any evidence at this time to demonstrate how each of the proposed LGS designations meet the tests of national policy.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – Supporting Document 12 – Green Spaces Assessment sets out the reasons for allocation against the tests.
	<b>Eye 21 - 24</b>			
		AMP	Support but some effort is required to ensure that the old Town Centre is not neglected because of the new shopping and parking proposals.	<b>Comments noted.</b>

	<b>Section 7 - Movement</b>			
	<b>Eye 25 – car parking</b>			
		AMP	Eye needs more parking – I support all of the initiatives for parking in this plan. Management should provide for paid parking and/or time limited parking.	<b>Comment noted</b> – management of car parking is not a matter for the ENP.
		AMP	At the moment parking in Eye has become a great problem and so it should definitely be addressed asap.	<b>Comment noted</b>
		AMP	Use the land behind the Church Street Supermarket for additional car parking.as an extension to Buckshorn CP.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the intentions of the respected landowners on this possibility are not known and therefore cannot be added to the Plan at this stage but they could come forward independently.
		Suffolk County Council	The County Council parking guidance, which has been adopted by Mid Suffolk District Council, is the Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2015). This has been recognised within the plan polices including policies Eye 11, Eye 17, Eye 22, and Eye 32. However the policies specify specific parts of this guidance (i.e. cycle parking) but there are other important elements to the parking guidance, such as disabled parking, which will not be covered by the policies in the plan. It is recommended that a policy within the plan adopts the parking guidance as a whole, and where the Town Council wish to set their own standard, this would need to be clearly explained and justified.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – policy Eye 17 to be amended to refer to all car parking being in accord with the standards except where otherwise specified in the Plan,

		Suffolk County Council	In addition to referring to cycle parking standards and cycle routes in the plan, it may also be beneficial for the plan to identify where cycle parking would be desirable within the town. Specifying good locations where cycle parking would be beneficial (such as near shops or other services in the centre of town) would be beneficial to making the town more cycle friendly.	<b>Comments noted</b> – should be considered in the traffic management plan.
	<b>Eye 26 – Public Rights of Way East</b>			
		Suffolk County Council	Discussion with the Town Council and the PRow team identified that the route proposed on figure 17 is too narrow and runs along the top of a steep bank which could be a danger. An alternative option was identified, and figure 17 and policies maps within the plan will need to be updated to reflect this.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend plan to show revised cycle route.
		MSDC	Should say “ <i>is proposed</i> ” rather than “ <i>should be provided</i> ”. The Plan is not clear on how this will be delivered – who will do it, how will it be funded, can this be achieved through the development management process?	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – policy wording to be changed as suggested. Delivery to be dealt with in the traffic management and infrastructure plans.
	<b>Eye 27 – Public Rights of Way West</b>			
		AMP	I would prefer to see this policy referring to the network of existing public rights of way and cycle-ways within the whole town. The important concept is to improve provision so that it encourages use through walking and cycling and so links parts of the town together.  Attention to the pedestrian and cycle opportunities along Wellington Road is very important and design of this route as shared space giving priority to walkers and bicycles would make a great difference to safety within the town.	<b>Comments noted</b> – Policy Eye 28 refers to general improvements to the network being supported and the details will be considered in the traffic management and infrastructure plans.

			Opportunities should be taken to improve the network of public rights of way and cycle-ways within the town to boost their use by residents and visitors. This would be through enhanced safety measures, surfacing and new connections. All levels of public bodies should cooperate to improve the maintenance, signing and promotion of these routes.	
		MSDC	This is a community aspiration rather than a development management policy	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – it's a land use infrastructure proposal
		T W Baldwin	The footpath and cycleway proposed by Policy Eye 26 runs through land under the control of our client. The proposed improvements are entirely logical and would enhance the wider connectivity of the town. Indeed, the delivery of the improvements would rectify the Town Council's concerns that AECOM Sites 5 and 6 are isolated from the rest of the town. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed route cannot be delivered in isolation without residential development to enable its delivery. To support the aims and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan moving forward our client would be keen to discuss the proposed route as part of wider discussions regarding the land south of Castleton Road which is promoted for residential development.	<b>Comments noted</b>
	<b>Eye 25 - 28</b>			
		AMP	Support but cycleway/footpaths must be provided to and from the Airfield Business Area, the Town Centre and neighbouring villages.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	<b>Eye 28 – Improvement of Public Rights of Way</b>			
		AMP	Public Rights of Way are essential for access and leisure – would like to see better signposting/maintenance and more cycle paths.	<b>Comments noted.</b>

		Suffolk County Council	Walking and cycling is a key part of the plan, and the engagement that has taken place between the Town Council and the SCC Public Rights of Way Team is welcome. The following comments suggest text that could be included in the plan in order to fully describe the PRoW network in Eye and link potential improvements of the network to sites.	<b>Comments Noted</b> – see specific wording changes.
		Suffolk County Council	At Eye 28 there is a typo. This should read “developer contributions”, rather than “develop contributions”	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – change wording
		AMP	Rapsy Tapsy Lane as a developed cycle/footpath to education facilities? The old rail viaduct?	<b>Comments noted</b> – it is proposed to use the railway embankment but Rapsey Tapsey Lane does not lead to areas of population so is unlikely to be improved although it is already a bridleway.
	<b>Eye 29/30 – Electric Vehicle Charging</b>			
		Amber REI	Whilst we support the principle and motivation surrounding Policies Eye 29 and Eye 30, we object to the unjustified requirements specified. Particularly in Eye 30 where all new parking is required to provide 20% Electric Vehicle Charing Points. This is unsubstantiated as there is no objective evidence to support the 20% requirement, this weakens the policy and makes it unjustifiable. The requirements, while based off insight within Supporting Document 15 (Electric Vehicle Charging), do not result from detail assessments / surveying that would provide a more accurate and robust figure. Accordingly, we recommend removal of these policies.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> –Policy 29 is supported by the NPPF:  <i>Paragraph 105 of the NPPF states that ‘local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should consider... e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.’</i>  <i>Paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that ‘applications for development should... be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.’</i>

				<p>In addition, Suffolk County-wide adopted parking standards<sup>2</sup> apply:</p> <p><i>Section 3.4.2 of the Suffolk Parking Standards states that “Access to charging points should be made available in every residential dwelling.”</i></p> <p><i>Section 3.4.2 of the Suffolk Parking Standards states that “The developer shall provide and maintain an electricity supply for charging points. A minimum of 1 space per every 20 non-residential spaces should have charging points installed for electric vehicles.”</i></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY ACCEPTED</b> – the 20% requirement in Policy 30 should be reduced to a minimum 10% EV charging point provision in order to be in line with the Suffolk Parking Standard for the closest equivalent development use type, that being new build pubs/hotels/restaurants</p>
		Suffolk County Council	<p>In order to be specific regarding the parking requirements for new residences the following wording is suggested to amend the first sentence.</p> <p><i>“All new residential developments should provide electric vehicle charging options in line with the SCC Parking Guidance and enable access to all electric vehicle charging options to all residences.”</i></p>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend wording as suggested.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/2015-11-16-FINAL-2015-Updated-Suffolk-Guidance-for-Parking.pdf>

		AMP	Oppose – not enough demand for EV and would reduce car parking spaces for other traffic	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – car parking space would not be significantly reduced and demand for EV is expected to increase.
	<b>Eye 29,30 and 31 – Electric V Charging and Traffic Management Plan</b>			
		AMP	Need to think about the future of Eye retail – increasing population will create pressure on roads and the centre cannot cope with the increase in traffic. Traffic Management is therefore important and need to think about the increased use of electric cars.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	<b>Eye 31 – Traffic Management Plan</b>			
		AMP	Traffic Management will need to be revisited on a regular basis.	<b>AGREED</b>
		MSDC	This Policy cannot be implemented and should be deleted. It implies putting an embargo on granting any planning permission in Eye. It could be expressed in a different way as a community aspiration as something that is desirable. It should also make it clear how it will be achieved and who will do it.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – revise policy to remove the requirement for a TMP before any development is permitted
		T W Baldwin	<p>Policy 31 requests that <i>“before any further development is permitted in Eye including the Reserved Matters application for the South of Eye Airfield site a traffic management Plan should be prepared”</i>. ?? be deleted??</p> <p>We object to this draft policy as it is for individual development proposals to demonstrate that they are acceptable in highways terms. Where required and agreed with the local highway authority individual development proposals take into account other committed development.</p> <p>The Town Council are reminded that the Land South of Eye Airfield development has already been found to be acceptable in highways terms by virtue of the outline planning process</p>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – revise policy to remove the requirement for a TMP before any development is permitted

			<p>where highways impact was considered by local highway authority.</p> <p>As currently drafted, Policy Eye 31 could potentially restrict development from coming forward in Eye, furthermore the policy is not justified, effective or consistent with national planning policy. As such, the policy should be deleted from the draft Plan.</p>	
		Suffolk County Council	<p>SCC understand that traffic issues are a major concern to eye residents, however it is not appropriate for a policy to prevent development due to lack of a transport management plan. This policy does not apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF, which states that “plans should positively seek to meet the development needs of their area...”. Rather than prohibiting development proposed in the plan without a traffic management plan, the Neighbourhood Plan should set out what traffic management is required through evidence. SCC can support Eye Town Council with traffic management within Eye as a result of growth. The 20mph area proposal has been progressing and The Town Council may wish to propose other traffic management methods as the Neighbourhood Plan is developed. Depending on the resources available from the Town Council, traffic modelling could be carried out by the County Council, or possibly an external consultant, which could help identify the measures necessary to manage traffic impacts within the town.</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – revise policy to remove the requirement for a TMP before any development is permitted</p> <p><b>Comment noted</b> – ETC will discuss with SCC</p>
		AMP	<p>Traffic management needs to take account of the effects of noise and air pollution and every efforts should be made to reduce traffic levels.</p>	<b>Comments noted</b>
		AMP	<p>There is no mentioned of improving access to the town at the A140 junctions</p>	<b>Comments noted</b> – there is a commitment from SCC to provide two new roundabouts by 2020
		AMP	<p>Concerned about traffic safety in Church Street/Wellington Street.</p>	<b>Comments noted</b> – will be considered in the TMP

		Amber REI	<p>We object to the inclusion of Policy Eye 31, which requests a Traffic Management Plan should be prepared prior <i>“to any further development being permitted in Eye”</i>.</p> <p>This requirement fails to consider that such assessments or plans will be required for individual cases. There should only be a requirement of a Traffic Management Plan if a development is found to require traffic management. This blanket approach is not justified or appropriate as it would stifle all development in Eye, adversely impacting the settlements sustainability. As such, this policy should be deleted from the NDP.</p>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – revise policy to remove the requirement for a TMP before any development is permitted
		AMP	<p>Support but time to consider some pedestrianisation in the centre. Provide direct access to the Airfield area from the A140 via one of the new roundabouts and stop heavy traffic on the B1077.</p>	<b>Comments noted</b> – to be addressed in the TMP
		AMP	<p>Cars are making life difficult in the centre of Eye and parking is a problem. An event at the Church caused major problems and speeds are too high. Make sure speed limits and parking is respected.</p>	<b>Comments noted</b> – additional car parking and the TMP is planned
		AMP	<p>The development of a workable traffic management plan must be a pre requisite for any further development in eye. At present there is great difficulty in finding a parking space for those of us unable to walk even modest distances.</p>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – a traffic management plan is needed but cannot be used to stop development.
		AMP	<p>Improvements to access to the main roads is long overdue and improvements must be made before any further development takes place.</p>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – new A140 roundabouts are planned for implementation in 2020 but the ENP cannot be used to prevent development in the meantime
		AMP	<p>Traffic Management Plan must be a starting point to look at complexity of current arrangements. Need effective access to A140 and management of Castleton Way/Victoria Hill, Broad Street/Magdalen Street and Cross Street/Magdalen Street junctions. Speed limit change.</p>	<b>Comments noted</b> and relate to the TMP

	<b>Section 8 – Eye Business area</b>			
	<b>Para 8.1</b>			
		MSDC	Delete “ <i>that 5 years later....to produce</i> ”	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – this is a statement of fact.
	<b>Eye 32 – Eye Business Area</b>			
		AMP	Support – need higher skilled jobs to keep young people in Eye – should not be just a general industrial area	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		MSDC	“consistent”	<b>Comments noted</b> – its not clear the change that is being proposed.
		AMP	Where will employment be provided for the increased population – 5920 people say 2960 working – outside Eye is not a viable answer.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the increase in population as a result of the housing allocations will be about 1500 not 2960. In modern economies people don’t necessary work close to where they live but the increase in economic activity on the Airfield Business Plan is supported in the Plan.
	<b>Section 9 – Infrastructure and Deliverability</b>			
	<b>Para 9.2</b>			
		MSDC	Delete last sentence	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – this is a statement of fact.
	<b>Eye 33 - Infrastructure</b>			
		AMP	Concerned about the lack of medical and other infrastructure.	<b>Comments noted</b> – the proposal to prepare an Infrastructure Plan is intended to ensure as far as possible that growth is matched by the necessary improvements to infrastructure.
		MSDC	The second sentence of the policy should be deleted. The way in which the MSDC element of CIL is used is set out in the Regulation 123 list and the CIL expenditure framework.	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – Eye has no confidence that MSDC will ensure that Eye has the necessary infrastructure to match the growth proposed. The risk that the necessary levels of infrastructure improvements will not be provided is a major concern of local people.

				This risk is compounded by the fact that the amount the Town Council can obtain is limited to 15% capped at £100 per household – about £10,000 per year – because of the failure of MSDC to approve the application for a NP in 2013.
		AMP	Support	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		Suffolk County Council	<p>The second sentence of this policy is not appropriate as CIL expenditure is determined by the regulation 123 list at Mid Suffolk District Council. SCC will also make applications to Mid Suffolk District Council for CIL funding in line with its responsibilities. This will include expenditure within Eye, such as expanding school facilities, however there may also be expenditure from CIL which serve a wider, strategic purpose, meaning that it is not spent in Eye directly. Examples of this from the regulation 123 list are the provision of waste infrastructure or strategic flood measures.</p> <p>As such it is recommended that the second sentence of this policy is deleted.</p> <p>SCC can offer support to a Town Council led infrastructure plan, by providing information and advice for areas of County responsibility. The early engagement that has already taken place between the Town Council and County Council is most welcome and the County Council will continue to offer support where possible.</p>	<p><b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – Eye has no confidence that MSDC will ensure that Eye has the necessary infrastructure to match the growth proposed. The risk that the necessary levels of infrastructure improvements will not be provided is a major concern of local people. This risk is compounded by the fact that the amount the Town Council can obtain is limited to 15% capped at £100 per household – about £10,000 per year – because of the failure of MSDC to approve the application for a NP in 2013.</p> <p>The policy recognises that there will be strategic needs as it asks for the ‘majority of CIL expenditure to be invested in the infrastructure requirements of the Town’ and these requirements could be also be strategic requirements that serve Eye and a wider area – investments in Hartismere Health and Care, the Local Surgery and the Schools for example.</p> <p>The support provided by the County Council has been very welcome and in contrast to the actions of the District Council.</p>
		Suffolk County Council	SCC welcome the work done in the Neighbourhood Plan to understand the infrastructure requirements raised by development. It is understood that the Town Council wish to develop an infrastructure plan to support the Neighbourhood	<b>Comments noted.</b>

			<p>Plan. SCC can offer support by providing information and advice for the areas of County Council responsibility. An infrastructure plan should consider requirements, costs and how the infrastructure will be delivered (e.g. section 106 agreements, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), or policy requirements). SCC would also recommend that Mid-Suffolk District Council is also involved as the local planning authority and the recipient of CIL.</p>	<p><b>ACTION</b> - The support offered regarding the Infrastructure Plan is welcome – contact SCC to discuss arrangements.</p>
		Suffolk County Council	<p>Secondary education in Eye is provided by Hartismere High School, which also serves a wider catchment. The site currently has a capacity of 961 places and as it occupies a large site it has the ability to expand to 1300 places. It is expected that the school would be able to accommodate the growth proposed in the plan.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p>
		Suffolk County Council	<p>Suffolk Fire &amp; Rescue Service has considered the plan and are of the opinion that, given the level of growth proposed, we do not envisage additional service provision will need to be made in order to mitigate the impact. However, this will be reconsidered if service conditions change.</p> <p>As always, SFRS would encourage the provision of automated fire suppression sprinkler systems in any new development as it not only affords enhanced life and property protection but if incorporated into the design/build stage it is extremely cost effective and efficient.</p> <p>SFRS will not have any objection with regard access, as long as access is in accordance with building regulation guidance. We will of course wish to have included adequate water supplies for firefighting, specific information as to the number and location can be obtained from our water officer via the normal consultation process.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted..</b></p>

		Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG	<p>The CCG is encouraged to see mention of healthy lifestyles reducing the impact on local healthcare facilities and welcomes this inclusion in the local plan. The CCG recognises that the Town of Eye do have primary healthcare facilities actually inside the parish. To maintain a primary care service for the residents of Eye, mitigation might be sought through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or Section 106 contributions from developments in the Town.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan provides for up to 685 dwellings in the parish. Ipswich &amp; East Suffolk CCG would like to make the Town Council aware that smaller developments make it more difficult to gain mitigation through CIL or Section 106 for healthcare than larger developments done in one go. The number of residents proposed in the NP will result in a significant increase of patients on the Eye Health Centre patient list and options will need to be looked at to mitigate against the impact.</p> <p>We would welcome the addition of a simple statement, to confirm that Eye Town Council will support Ipswich &amp; East Suffolk CCG and NHS England in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of Primary Healthcare services for the residents of Eye. Ipswich &amp; East Suffolk CCG would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the Town Council potential solutions to ensure sustainable Primary Care services for the local community going forward.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p> <p><b>Comments noted.</b></p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – add a statement to this effect.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – arrange a meeting with IESCCG.</p>
		AMP	<p>Infrastructure is key to this Plan – more housing = pressure on roads, health education etc. All residents are concerned about the lack of infrastructure proposals.</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> – see responses above.</p>
		AMP	<p>My only concerns are the effect of traffic through the Town, the necessity for the roundabouts to gain access to the A140 before</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b> – the proposed Traffic Management Plan is recognition that traffic issues need to be considered further. The roundabout</p>

			any major development takes place along with other infrastructure such as health and education facilities.	improvements are programmed for 2020 but the development of the 280 houses south of Eye Airfield is likely to start in 2019. The ENP cannot effect either of these.
		Occuld Parish Council	Has the Steering Committee been in contact with health, social care and other essential services, and has it received assurances that impact assessments are being / will be carried out to ensure that all necessary increases in staffing, equipment etc. will be available when required? We note, for example, that the Chair of the Steering Committee has stated that currently doctors' lists are full.	<b>Comments noted</b> – unfortunately the planning system does not ensure that infrastructure can be increased to meet demand before development is permitted – the proposed Infrastructure Plan is an attempt to ensure that infrastructure is improved to meet increased demand.
	<b>Table 6 Eye 6</b>			
		MSDC	Suggest rewording in line with comments set out in covering letter.	<b>Comments noted</b> – there is no specific reference to Table 6 in the covering letter so it is not clear what change is being requested.
	<b>Table 6 Eye 28</b>			
		MSDC	<i>“Developer”</i> contributions	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – correct typo
	<b>Section 10 – Policy Maps</b>			
		Amber REI	Support the larger site shown on the policy maps and request the PE11 parking indicator be shown on the west of the site.	<b>Comments noted</b> – see responses above re Policy Eye 5.
	<b>Glossary</b>			
		Suffolk County Council	It may be helpful if the glossary included definitions of different PRoW status. This would be as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Footpath – only for use on foot or with a mobility vehicle</li> </ul>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – add definition to Glossary

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Bridleway – use as per a public footpath, and on horseback or by bicycle</li> <li>• Restricted Byway – use as per a bridleway, and by a ‘non-motorised vehicle’, e.g. a horse and carriage</li> <li>• Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) – can be used by all vehicles, in addition to people on foot, mobility vehicle, horseback and bicycle</li> </ul>	
	<b>Other comments</b>			
	A Group of Students at Hartismere High School considered the plan and the three groups made the following comments:			
		Group1	<p>Good use of the areas of green space</p> <p>Issues of traffic due to the move of the Primary School towards the High School</p> <p>More roads needed in and around large development area</p> <p>Houses seem to be concentrated in one area – difficult to avoid congestion.</p> <p>Movement of doctors surgery into hospital is good</p>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
		Group 2	<p>Good plan</p> <p>Moving Primary School near high school is a good use of space</p> <p>Keeping car parks near supermarket won't waste as much space</p> <p>Put the houses around the allotments</p> <p>Maintain green spaces and places to walk dogs</p> <p>Keep Supermarket as close to Eye as possible</p> <p>Join the road in the new development to the main road</p>	<b>Comments noted.</b>

		Group 3	<p>Like: Supermarket on the chicken factory site Cross street car park extension Where the houses are proposed to go</p> <p>Don't like: Supermarket near airfield as will attract people away from the Town centre Castleton Way already busy with primary school as well busses wouldn't get through Junction from Castleton Way into Eye is already crazy.</p>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	Young people	AMP	Concerned that no provision is made for young people – other than the skate park they have nowhere to go.	<b>Comments noted</b> – the proposed leisure centre will include provision for young people
		AMP	Concerned about water and drainage implications	<b>Comments noted</b> –there have been no objections from infrastructure providers about water and drainage.
		AMP	Change Wellington Street to Wellington Road – page 38/para 4.26, Page 39/Policy Eye 6 and page 76 fig 18 and Policy Eye 27	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend policy and text accordingly.
		AMP	Change Town Stream to Lamsey Beck – page 67/policy eye 10 and page 68.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – amend policy and text accordingly
	Minerals	Suffolk County Council	<p>There are no areas of current or proposed extraction in Eye. As the Minerals Planning Authority SCC reviews proposals for their potential impact on available sand and gravel resources, as development can make resources unextractable (i.e. sterile). There are sand and gravel resources throughout the parish, which are mainly associated with water courses. However, as the proposed site allocations either avoid these areas or are in the built up area of Eye where extraction is unsuitable. Because of this the neighbourhood plan should not cause any minerals safeguarding issues.</p>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
	Waste Disposal		The Waste Core Strategy and the SMWLP contain policies that safeguard existing and proposed waste Facilities. Facilities in eye are Eye Power Station, which is identified as an Incinerator	<b>Comments noted.</b>

			<p>with Energy Recovery, and an Anglian Water waste water treatment facility. There is one site on The Street in Denham, F A Edwards and Sons (a Metals and End of Life Vehicles facility) which abuts the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>All of these sites are a significant distance away from the main conurbation of Eye and so it is not considered that the neighbourhood plan proposals would cause a waste safeguarding issue.</p>	
	The Chicken Factory Magdalene Street	Amber REI	<p>The Chicken Factory sits to the west of Eye and is well connected to the centre settlement in distance but not character or appearance. It has potential to be developed for approximately 72 homes, with good connectivity to the town centre and opportunities to enhance additional areas of land for SuDS and parking access on land to the west of the factory buildings. A food store and associated facilities can be situated to the south east corner of the site with associated parking spaces.</p> <p>This is a significant opportunity to relocate a substantial viable business to a more appropriate location, thus delivering sustainable high-quality development and local services to enhance the western edge of Eye.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the Chicken Factory will be an opportunity to enhance the immediate area's character and integrate the site into the existing built context. A result of developing this site will be a sustainable increase in population that will contribute to the success and vitality of existing services in the settlement. The redevelopment of the site can also provide local services on a minimum of 0.5ha to serve the needs of existing residents. This will encourage walking and cycling within Eye, while sensitively increasing the services available in the settlement.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b> – see specific responses above re parking. It is not clear what local services referred to are.</p>

			There is potential to facilitate parking to the west of the factory where planning consent has been granted for 81 parking spaces on low quality scrub / grass land (1891/16). This land is effectively an operational element of the wider Chicken Factory site, which has the potential to support the identified need for parking spaces. The parcel of land to the north of the identified parking area (west) can be enhanced with a wildlife / open space / SuDS planting scheme to enhance the quality of the site and surrounding ecosystems. This arrangement would establish a larger portion of the brownfield site to deliver housing growth and local shopping services to the benefit of the local area and ensure the redevelopment was viable.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> – proposals for wildlife/open spaces/planting are welcome and will be added to policy.
	Victoria Mill Base	AMP	What is the proposed future for the Victoria Mill base?	<b>Comments noted</b> – there are no proposals that would affect this feature.
	Design and Global Warming	AMP	What does focus on design mean in reference to global warming – could Eye benefit from Zero Energy development?	<b>Comments noted</b> – the Plan does not put forward any standards for energy efficiency so national standards will apply.
	Consultation Process	AMP	On a separate note I would like to voice some concerns about the process for consultation used. The first of these concerns results from the fact that I struggled to complete the response form online, and also that I was informed by the Library that they had no forms, despite previously reading that forms could be found there. Clearly as you will appreciate, if people are unable or discouraged from responding, then the responses that are received may not be a true reflection of how residents feel about the proposed Neighbourhood plan.	<b>Comments noted</b> – no other concerns about being able to respond raised.
	Sale of Allotments	AMP	On another note I also have an ethical concern. This is that earlier this year that other allotment holders and myself received two letters from the Town Council regarding the potential sale of the allotments. The first of these letters appeared to suggest that thought had been given to selling the allotment land to the developer who would potentially build on the field space behind	<b>Comments noted</b> – no decisions have been taken to sell the Town Council’s land and no discussions have taken place regarding any sale with any developers. If any sale does take place then the process would be governed by the Town Council’s regulations.

			<p>Castleton Way. Whilst I appreciate that the suggestion may have been based on the belief that this would reap a greater financial reward, my concern is that this suggestion would appear to propose selling land to one potential buyer, for one potential purpose, rather than the usual tendering process. Furthermore with the Council now proposing that the future plan incorporate the specific change of use needed to allocate the allotment land for potential housing development, this may be perceived by some as the Council trying to facilitate its own earlier suggestion of land sale. Whilst I appreciate that the Town Council is likely acting in what it views as the best interests of the Eye community, I did none the less wish to share my concern about how this could be viewed.</p>	
	<b>Table 2 Site and AECOM Assessment</b>	Mr T Baldwin	<p><b>AECOM Site 2:</b> This site forms part of the proposed ‘Reserve Allocation’ site and further agricultural land to the south and west.</p> <p>The site has seemingly been assigned an amber rating, rather than a green, in the AECOM document as it is seen as an isolated location for housing without the delivery of the approved development at Land south of Eye Airfield.</p> <p>The site assessment also identifies potential constraints presented by HSE consultation/safety zones.</p> <p>The Site assessment concludes that the land to the south within the site, which falls outside of the HSE consultation zone, could be allocated for 360 dwellings.</p>	<b>NOT ACCEPTED</b> – the plan allocates sufficient housing sites.
			<p><b>AECOM Site 5 and 6:</b> Table 3.3 states that Eye Town Council consider Sites 5 and 6 to be a single site; and comments that both sites, if developed, would be isolated.</p> <p>In addition, Table 3.3 also states that development of Site 6 would significantly reduce the gap between Eye and Yaxley.</p> <p>On the basis of the above comments both sites were not subject to further detailed assessment by AECOM.</p>	

			<p>Site 5 is located adjacent to the boundary of <u>Hartismere High School</u>. These facilities by their very nature are at the heart of the local community. The development of Site 12 (subject of an outline planning approval) for housing will introduce new built form north of Castleton Road and new highway infrastructure to enhance the wider connectivity of Site 5 and Site 6. ¶</p> <p>Figure 3.1 of the AECOM Site Assessment document identifies all sites that have been assessed in some form by AECOM and the Town Council. The site area mapped for Site 6 is incorrect and does not align with the site area promoted by our client via the SHELAA. ¶</p> <p>Figure 3.1 shows Site 6 to be extending approximately 350 meters further east along Castleton Way. Indeed, the total area of the land incorrectly included within Site 6 measures approximately 12ha. ¶</p> <p>When mapped correctly, it is apparent that Site 6 would not extend eastwards, beyond the site boundary of Site 2 to the north of Castleton Road. Site 2 has attracted no criticism in respect</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Site 5 is located adjacent to the boundary of <u>Hartismere High School</u>. These facilities by their very nature are at the heart of the local community. The development of Site 12 (subject of an outline planning approval) for housing will introduce new built form north of Castleton Road and new highway infrastructure to enhance the wider connectivity of Site 5 and Site 6.¶</p> <p>Figure 3.1 of the AECOM Site Assessment document identifies all sites that have been assessed in some form by AECOM and the Town Council. The site area mapped for Site 6 is incorrect and does not align with the site area promoted by our client via the SHELAA.¶</p> <p>Figure 3.1 shows Site 6 to be extending approximately 350 meters further east along Castleton Way. Indeed, the total area of the land incorrectly included within Site 6 measures approximately 12ha.¶</p> <p>When mapped correctly, it is apparent that Site 6 would not extend eastwards, beyond the site boundary of Site 2 to the north of Castleton</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>When mapped correctly, it is apparent that Site 6 would not extend eastwards, beyond the site boundary of Site 2 to the north of Castleton Road. Site 2 has attracted no criticism in respect of it extending towards <u>Yaxley</u> in a detrimental manner.¶</p> <p>The comment, in the AECOM document and at paragraph 4.40 of the draft Plan, that the development of Site 6 would significantly reduce the gap between Eye and <u>Yaxley</u> is not justified and furthermore has been made on the basis of incorrect mapping.¶</p> <p>When taking into account the location of the school and college adjacent to Site 5; the proposed allocation at Site 12; and the proposed reserve allocation at Site 2 (which we contend should be extended in area and become a full allocation), it is apparent that Sites 5 and 6 will not be unduly isolated from the rest of the town. In addition, the connectivity and suitability of Sites 5 and 6 for residential development will be further enhanced by the delivery of Policy Eye 26 which promotes a new footpath and cycleway linking the sites to the centre of the Town.¶</p> <p>Summary: In light of the above, we contend that not only should Sites 5 and 6 be subject to additional assessment by AECOM they should also be allocated for residential development.⌘</p>	
--	--	--	--

