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Non-Technical Summary

What is Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)?
A strategic environmental assessment has been undertaken to inform the Eye Neighbourhood Plan. This process is required by the SEA Regulations.

Neighbourhood Plan groups use SEA to assess Neighbourhood Plans against a set of sustainability objectives developed in consultation with interested parties. The purpose of the assessment is to avoid adverse environmental and socio-economic effects through the Neighbourhood Plan and identify opportunities to improve the environmental quality of the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan and the quality of life of residents.

What is the Eye Neighbourhood Plan?
The Eye Neighbourhood Plan is currently being prepared as a Neighbourhood Development Plan under the Localism Act 2011 and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared in the context of Mid Suffolk’s Core Strategy with due regard to the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.

It is currently anticipated that the Neighbourhood Plan will be submitted to Mid Suffolk District Council in spring 2019 and undergo a referendum later in this year.

Purpose of this Environmental Report
This Environmental Report, which accompanies the current consultation on the Eye Neighbourhood Plan, is the second document to be produced as part of the SEA process. The first document was the SEA Scoping Report (February 2019), which includes information about the Neighbourhood Plan area’s environment and community.

The purpose of this Environmental Report is to:
- Identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan and alternatives; and
- Provide an opportunity for consultees to offer views on any aspect of the SEA process which has been carried out to date.

The Environmental Report contains:
- An outline of the contents and main objectives for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan and its relationship with other relevant policies, plans and programmes;
- Relevant aspects of the current and future state of the environment and key sustainability issues;
- The SEA Framework of objectives against which the Eye Neighbourhood Plan has been assessed;
- The appraisal of alternative approaches for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan;
- The likely significant environmental effects of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan;
- The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects as a result of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan; and
- The next steps for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan and accompanying SEA process.
Assessment of reasonable alternatives for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan

Housing numbers to deliver through the Neighbourhood Plan

The results of the various consultations completed to support the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan (see Supporting Documents SD4, SD20 and SD21) outline consistent views that the housing requirements within Eye should meet the following objectives:

- Directed primarily at meeting the needs of the younger population for affordable housing and the needs of an ageing population with smaller and/or specialist accommodation;
- In the form of smaller developments preferable within the town and not in the form of major expansions onto greenfield sites; and
- Supported with improvements to community infrastructure.

The Local Plan identifies Eye as a ‘Market Town’ which is identified as being located within a ‘functional cluster’ of settlements that have the potential to accommodate more than its own housing needs. The spatial distribution and total number of dwellings within each settlement has yet to be determined by Mid Suffolk District Council.

Outline planning permission has already been granted on land South of Eye Airfield for 280 dwellings and a 60-place residential home. Whilst this surpasses the Housing Needs Assessment target of 164 dwellings for the town, the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that the proposals are not likely to meet the affordable housing and specialist housing requirements within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Therefore, the proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area are not only based on delivering a target number of new dwellings but are also intended to meet specific housing requirements and/or other objectives for the local community.

Assessment of reasonable alternatives for site allocations

To support the vision statements of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Steering Group were keen to consider alternative locations for delivering housing provision in the parish. Completed in June 2018, an independent and objective assessment of eleven potential sites was undertaken by AECOM. Eight sites were shortlisted from the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), with a further three sites put forward by Eye Town Council.

To support the consideration of the suitability of these eleven sites for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, the SEA process has undertaken an appraisal of the key environmental constraints present at each of the sites and potential effects that may arise because of development. In this context the sites have been considered in relation to the SEA Framework of objectives and decision-making questions developed during SEA scoping and the baseline information. This SEA site assessment was undertaken as a separate exercise to the Neighbourhood Plan site assessment.

The findings of the assessment of the site options are presented in Chapter 4 of this SEA Report.

Following a consideration of the site assessments undertaken for the Neighbourhood Plan, SEA findings, further evidence base studies and the consultation responses, the Neighbourhood Plan is proposing to take forward six of the eleven sites for residential allocations, namely:

- Site 3: Land north of Victoria Mill Allotments (34 dwellings);
- Site 4: Victoria Mill Allotments (72 dwellings);
- Site 9: The Chicken Factory Area (78 dwellings);
- Site 11: Eye Health Centre and Hartismere Health and Care (43 dwellings);
- Site 12: Land South of Eye Airfield (280 dwellings and a 60-place care home); as per planning application ‘3563/15’ and
• Site 13: Paddock House, Church Street (12 dwellings).

These will deliver a total of 519 dwellings during the plan period.

The allocations above will be accompanied by 60 dwellings through windfall sites and proposals for a crematorium (Site 7), parking areas, an aspirational policy for new residential development (Site 10) and a reserved site for future expansion in the longer term of around 174 dwellings on Site 2: Reserve Site South of Eye Airfield, and a new primary school/sports centre expansion on land directly to the west and south (respectively) of the Hartismere High School.

**Assessment of the submission version of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan**

To support the implementation of the vision statements for the Neighbourhood Plan, the submission version of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan puts forward 35 policies to guide new development within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Utilising the SEA Framework of objectives and assessment questions developed during the earlier scoping stage of the SEA, the SEA process has assessed the policies put forward through the current version of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Environmental Report has presented the findings of the assessment under the following SEA themes:

- Biodiversity;
- Climate Change;
- Landscape;
- Historic Environment;
- Land, Soil and Water Resources
- Population and Community;
- Health and Wellbeing; and
- Transportation.

The assessment has concluded that the current version of the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to lead to significant positive effects in relation to the ‘Population and Community’ SEA theme. This relates to the focus of the Neighbourhood Plan on the delivery of housing to meet locally arising needs, its impetus on safeguarding and enhancing community infrastructure, and through supporting the economic vitality of one of the key Market Towns within Mid Suffolk District. The Neighbourhood Plan is also likely to lead to significant positive effects in relation to the ‘Health and Wellbeing’ SEA theme, linked to its promotion of improved walking and cycling networks, enhancements to green infrastructure and open space provision, and the facilitation of high quality and sustainable design through the proposed allocations.

The Neighbourhood Plan will also bring positive approaches in relation to the ‘Landscape’ and ‘Historic Environment’ SEA themes. These benefits largely relate to the Neighbourhood Plan’s focus on protecting the integrity of the Special Landscape Area and locally important viewpoints, supporting the quality of the public realm, conserving and enhancing historic environment assets and their settings, and safeguarding potential below-ground archaeological features. Additionally, the Neighbourhood Plan will bring positive effects in relation to the ‘Biodiversity’ SEA theme through retaining habitats, enhancing ecological networks and delivering net gains through the proposed allocations. However, given the approaches taken forward through the Neighbourhood Plan will help limit potential effects from new development areas rather than secure significant enhancements, these impacts are less likely to comprise significant positive effects overall.

Regarding the ‘Land, Soil and Water Resources’ SEA theme, the Neighbourhood Plan will lead to positive effects relating to the potential regeneration of previously developed and/or underutilised land through new developments, given four of the six sites taken forward are on brownfield land. However, this is dependent on the extent to which the proposals incorporate high-quality and sensitive design, remediate potential contaminated land and protect both above and below ground water resources. Alongside, two of the six sites will be taken forward on greenfield land.
The Neighbourhood Plan will also initiate several beneficial approaches regarding the ‘Climate Change’ SEA theme, through encouraging lower carbon modes of transportation and through minimising the flood risks from new development areas. Likewise, the Neighbourhood Plan will also initiate several beneficial approaches for the ‘Transportation’ SEA theme, given its focus on reducing traffic congestion and by ensuring that new developments are in sustainable locations with good access to a range of services and facilities. However, these are not considered to be significant in the context of the SEA process given the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and the scale of proposals.

**Next steps**

This Environmental Report accompanies the Neighbourhood Plan for submission to the Local Planning Authority, Mid Suffolk District Council, for Independent Examination.

At Independent Examination, the Neighbourhood Plan will be considered in terms of whether it meets the Basic Conditions for Neighbourhood Plans and is in general conformity with the current adopted Local Plan document for Mid Suffolk.

If the Independent Examination is favourable, the Eye Neighbourhood Plan will be subject to a referendum, organised by Mid Suffolk District Council. If more than 50% of those who vote agree with the Neighbourhood Plan, then it will be ‘made’. Once made, the Eye Neighbourhood Plan will become part of the Development Plan for Eye Parish.
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1. Introduction

Background

1.1 AECOM has been commissioned to undertake an independent Strategic Environmental Assessment in support of Eye’s emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

1.2 The Eye Neighbourhood Plan is currently being prepared as a Neighbourhood Development Plan under the Localism Act 2011 and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared in the context of Mid Suffolk’s Core Strategy with due regard to the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.

1.3 It is currently anticipated that the Neighbourhood Plan will be submitted to Mid Suffolk District Council in spring 2019 and undergo a referendum later in this year.

1.4 Key information relating to the Eye Neighbourhood Plan is presented in Table 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1: Key facts relating to the Eye Neighbourhood Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Qualifying Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered by the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan contact point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEA explained

1.5 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is a mechanism for considering and communicating the impacts of an emerging plan, and potential alternatives in terms of key sustainability issues. The aim of SEA is to inform and influence the plan-making process with a view to avoiding and mitigating negative impacts. Through this approach, the SEA for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan seeks to maximise the developing plan's contribution to sustainable development.

1.6 SEA is undertaken to address the procedures prescribed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations) which transpose into national law the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive\(^1\). It also widens the scope of the assessment from focussing on environmental issues to further consider social and economic issues.

1.7 The Eye Neighbourhood Plan has been screened in by Mid Suffolk District Council as requiring an SEA. To meet this requirement, the Neighbourhood Plan is undergoing an SEA process which incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive.

1.8 The SEA will be undertaken to meet specific requirements prescribed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations).

1.9 Two key procedural requirements of the SEA Regulations are that:

1. When deciding on 'the scope and level of detail of the information' which must be included in the Environmental Report there is a consultation with nationally designated authorities concerned with environmental issues; and

2. A report (the 'Environmental Report') is published alongside the Draft Plan (i.e. the proposed submission version of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan) that presents outcomes from the environmental assessment (i.e. discusses 'likely significant effects' that would result from plan implementation) and reasonable alternatives.

---

\(^1\) Directive 2001/42/EC
Structure of this SEA Environmental Report

1.10 This document is the SEA Environmental Report for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan and hence needs to answer all four of the questions listed below with a view to providing the information required by the SEA Regulations. Each of the four questions is answered in turn within this report, as follows:

Table 1.2: Questions that must be answered by the SEA Environmental Report in order to meet the regulatory requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Report question</th>
<th>In line with the SEA Regulations, the report must include…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What’s the scope of the SEA?</strong></td>
<td>• An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the sustainability ‘context’?</td>
<td>• The relevant environmental protection objectives, established at international or national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the sustainability ‘baseline’?</td>
<td>• The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the key issues &amp; objectives?</strong></td>
<td>• Key problems/issues and objectives that should be a focus of (i.e. provide a ‘framework’ for) assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What has plan-making/SEA involved up to this point?</strong></td>
<td>• Outline reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with (and thus an explanation of the ‘reasonableness’ of the approach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The likely significant effects associated with alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outline reasons for selecting the preferred approach in-light of alternatives appraisal/a description of how environmental objectives and considerations are reflected in the current version of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the assessment findings at this stage?</strong></td>
<td>• The likely significant effects associated with the submission version of the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the submission version of the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What happens next?</strong></td>
<td>• The next steps for plan making/SEA process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004
3 NB this column does not quote directly from Schedule II of the Regulations. Rather, it reflects a degree of interpretation.
2. Local Plan context and vision for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan

Local Plan context for the Neighbourhood Plan

2.1 The current local strategic planning policy for Eye is presented through the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (adopted in 2008); Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Focused Review (adopted in 2012); Stowmarket Area Action Plan (adopted 2013); and the "saved" policies of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (adopted 1998).

2.2 The Core Strategy sets out the distribution and scale of development across the Mid Suffolk District, with the majority of development (including retail, employment and housing allocations) focussed within the 'Towns' and 'Key Service Centres' as defined in the settlement hierarchy. In the context of the Neighbourhood Plan area, Eye is designated as a 'Town' in the hierarchy, along with Stowmarket and Needham Market⁴. Neighbourhood plans are required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan and can develop policies and proposals to address local place-based issues.

2.3 An emerging Joint Local Plan is currently being prepared between Mid Suffolk District Council and Babergh District Council. However, the emerging Joint Local Plan is at a relatively early stage and therefore the Core Strategy remains the key policy document for the district. The latest public document of the emerging Joint Local Plan is the Consultation Document which was published in August 2017⁵, which contains the following considerations relevant to Eye (as summarised within the Neighbourhood Plan):

- Mid Suffolk has a residual need for new housing between 2017 and 2036 of 5,820 new dwellings over and above commitments (existing permissions) at a rate of 425 dwellings per year;
- Eye is recognised as an 'Urban Area & Market Town' within the proposed settlement hierarchy due it having a good range of services and facilities which could support sustainable development;
- Eye has been identified as the centre of a functional cluster, along with Braiseworth, Brome and Oalkey, Denham, Hoxne, Horham, Mellis, Occold, Redlingfield, Stoke Ash, Thornham Magna, Thornham Magna, Thornham Parva, and Yaxley;
- A proposal to retain the Eye Principal Shopping Area, which will be called the 'Eye District Centre'; and
- A settlement map for Eye which identifies three sites that have been assessed for development potential, namely: Land north of Castleton Road and south of the Airfield Industrial Area; Land to the east of Century Road, off Victoria Hill; and Paddock House.

2.4 As part of the Neighbourhood Plan’s development process, Eye Town Council’s Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have been exploring alternative housing and employment allocations in the parish which potentially could be delivered through the Neighbourhood Plan.

Vision, aims and objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan

2.5 The vision statements for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan, which were developed during earlier stages of plan development, are as follows:

"An attractive town: using the historic core to attract visitors and setting high standards to ensure new development is in keeping with the existing.

A walkable town: development concentrated within walking distance of facilities, with great cycling facilities too – cutting congestion and improving the air we breathe.

A connected town: linking up the whole town, including old and new and housing, employment and services.

An enterprising town: focused on small businesses in the town centre and larger firms, especially those specialising in innovative clean technology and food production, on the former Airfield.

A green town: integrated into its countryside and with community projects to encourage green energy and conservation.

A living town: growing in size to cope with new needs through new development providing sufficient low-cost homes.

An evolving town: changing gradually to meet new needs, locally and regionally, but with planned change when things need to alter."

Vision Statements for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan"
3. What is the scope of the SEA?

SEA Scoping Report

3.1 The SEA Regulations require that: “When deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information that must be included in the report, the responsible authority shall consult the consultation bodies”. In England, the consultation bodies are Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England. These authorities were consulted on the scope of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan SEA in February 2019.

3.2 The purpose of scoping was to outline the ‘scope’ of the SEA through setting out:

- A context review of the key environmental and sustainability objectives of national, regional and local plans and strategies relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan;
- Baseline data against which the Neighbourhood Plan can be assessed;
- The key sustainability issues for the Neighbourhood Plan; and
- An ‘SEA Framework’ of objectives against which the Neighbourhood Plan can be assessed.

3.3 Responses received on the Scoping Report, and how they were addressed, have been summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: Consultation responses received on the SEA Scoping Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Dean, Consultations Team (response received via email on 14th March 2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Historic England | Comment noted |
| Edward James, Historic Places Advisor (response received via email on 21st March 2019) | We would refer you to the guidance in Historic England Advice Note 8: Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment, which can be found here: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/sustainability-appraisal-and-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8/>. This advice sets out the historic environment factors which need to be considered during the Strategic Environmental Assessment or Sustainability Appraisal process, and our recommendations for information you may need to include. |

6 In-line with Article 6(3) of the SEA Directive, these consultation bodies were selected because ‘by reason of their specific environmental responsibilities, [they] are likely to be concerned by the environmental effects of implementing plans and programme’.
## Environment Agency

**Natalie Kermath, Planning Advisor (response received via email on 1st April 2019)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Agency</th>
<th>How the response was considered and addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Risk</strong></td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We note that you have used the Mid Suffolk Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, we wish to highlight that this is from 2008 and may be out of date. Newer Modelling may be available which will include climate change. Please contact us if this is required. The SEA report considers that Eye is not a dry island and we can confirm that we agree with this due to the size of land that is isolated by flood zones. Mitigation measures have been provided within section 4.5 including: water storage areas, rolling back development and resilience designs to buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Groundwater and contamination** | This has been acknowledged within the 'Land, Soil and Water Resources' section of the draft plan appraisal – see Chapter 5 of the Environmental Report. |
| The SEA has highlighted that the Neighbourhood area of Eye falls over source protections zones 1, 2 and 3. However, no mitigation measures have been suggested within the SEA. Site investigations may be required at application stage to determine on-site risks. |

| **Water Quality** | This is considered within the 'Land, Soil and Water Resources' section of the draft plan appraisal – see Chapter 5 of the Environmental Report. |
| The sea recognises that the River Dove has a water quality rating of 'moderate' and the factors that are currently stopping it from achieving a 'good' status are: sewage discharge, livestock, poor nutrient management and land drainage. The SEA report states that the Neighbourhood plan is unlikely to have an effect on this. We believe that the Neighbourhood plan should try and incorporate policies to help reduce the impacting factors so that the River Dove may achieve 'good' status. |

Please note that the view expressed in this letter by the Environment Agency is a response to the consultation request only and does not represent our final view in relation to any future planning or permit applications that may come forward. We reserve the right to change our position in relation to any such application.

Comment noted

---

3.4 Baseline information (including the context review and baseline data) is presented in Appendix A. The key sustainability issues and SEA Framework are presented below.

## Key Sustainability Issues

### Air Quality

- Air quality within the Neighbourhood Plan area is generally good, with no significant issues identified.
- As of September 2016, there are no AQMAs designated within the wider Mid Suffolk district.
Emissions associated with road transport (primarily NO₂) are the main pollutant of concern within the Mid Suffolk district. However, historical monitoring has not shown exceedances beyond the national air quality objective.

Due to the absence of any significant air quality issues within the Neighbourhood Plan area, the air quality theme has been scoped out for the purposes of the SEA process.

Biodiversity

- The ‘Major Farm, Braiseworth’ SSSI is located directly adjacent to the western boundary of the Neighbourhood Plan area. Land within a 50m radius of this site is within SSSI Impact Risk Zones for all planning applications.
- Located along the River Dove within the Neighbourhood Plan area, ‘The Pennings, Eye’ LNR supports a variety of locally important habitats and species.
- There are a variety of BAP priority habitats contributing to the local ecological networks within and surrounding the Neighbourhood Plan area, including areas of deciduous woodland, coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, and good quality semi-improved grassland.

Climate Change

- Any increases in the built footprint of the Neighbourhood Plan area (associated with the delivery of new housing and employment land) has the potential to increase overall greenhouse gas emissions in the parish.
- The total CO₂ emissions per capita within Mid Suffolk are higher than the regional and national totals and the overall percentage reduction of emissions within the Neighbourhood Plan area between 2005 and 2016 was less than regional and national totals.
- There are areas of land adjacent to the River Dove and its tributaries which are located within Flood Risk Zone 3, and as such, have a >1% chance of being flooded each year.
- Within the Neighbourhood Plan area, there are some areas of land at medium-high risk of surface water flooding.
- The Eye Neighbourhood Plan should seek to increase the resilience of the Neighbourhood Plan area to the effects of climate change by supporting and encouraging adaptation strategies.

Landscape

- The Neighbourhood Plan area is located entirely within the ‘South Norfolk and High Suffolk Claylands’ NCA, which is characterised by its high and predominantly flat clay plateau which is incised by numerous small-scale wooded river valleys with complex slopes.
- There are two LCAs which contribute to the distinctiveness of the Neighbourhood Plan area: The Ancient Plateau Claylands, and the River Valley Claylands.
- Land extending to the north and to the south of the town is classified as a Special Landscape Area.
- There are 14 important viewpoints within the Neighbourhood Plan area which overlook locally important areas of landscape value and contribute to the sense of place and visual amenity of Eye.

Historic Environment

- The historic character and evolution of the Neighbourhood Plan area has been shaped by a number of key influencers following the Norman Conquest. Through the centuries, Eye has prospered as a market town.
The Heritage and Settlement Sensitivity Assessment states that the area to the east of the settlement, particularly that between the Priory and the church, is highly sensitive to change, as is the relatively undeveloped southern edge of Eye.

The Neighbourhood Plan area contains a variety of nationally designated heritage assets including three Grade I, seven Grade II* and 154 Grade II listed buildings, along with eight scheduled monuments.

According to the 2018 Heritage at Risk Register for East England published by Historic England, the ‘Barn at Rook Hall’ scheduled monument is classified as being in a very bad condition.

It is currently not possible to determine whether the Grade II listed buildings within the Neighbourhood Plan are at risk.

Originally designated in 1970, the Eye Conservation Area covers the majority of the built-up area of the town, with its special qualities and distinctive features summarised within the Eye Conservation Area Appraisal which was completed in 2011.

The Historic Environmental Record for Suffolk contains 154 listings within the parish of Eye, including Anglo-Saxon artefacts and archaeological finds dating to the Bronze Age, Neolithic period, Mesolithic period and Roman period.

**Land, Soil and Water Resources**

- Eye Neighbourhood Plan area falls within a designated Surface Water Nitrate Vulnerable Zone. However, the Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to significantly affect this given it does not focus on agricultural issues.
- The ecological quality of the River Dove is considered to be “moderate”.
- Given the presence of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land in the Neighbourhood Plan area, development has the potential to lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

**Population and Community**

- The population of Eye increased at a higher rate between 2001 and 2011 than Mid Suffolk, the South East of England and England averages.
- Generally, there is a larger proportion of residents within the 60+ age category within the Neighbourhood Plan area (34.4%) in comparison to the total for Mid Suffolk (27.9%), the South East (23.3%) and England (22.3%).

**Health and Wellbeing**

- 80.3% of residents in the Neighbourhood Plan area consider themselves as having ‘very good health’ or ‘good health’, slightly lower than the totals for Mid Suffolk (83.2%), the South East of England (83.7%) and England (81.4%).
- A higher proportion of residents within the Neighbourhood Plan area report that their activities are limited in some way compared to regional and national averages.

**Transportation**

- The nearest railway station to the Neighbourhood Plan area is in Diss, approximately 4km away from the Neighbourhood Plan area boundary.
- There are twelve bus routes which pass through the Neighbourhood Plan area, however a lower percentage of residents in the Neighbourhood Plan catch a train, bus, minibus or coach to work in comparison to the regional and national trends.
- The Neighbourhood Plan area is well linked to the surrounding road network, with access to the A140 and A14.
84.0% of households in the Neighbourhood Plan area have access to at least one car or van.

### SEA Framework

3.5 The SEA Framework provides a way in which environmental effects can be defined and subsequently analysed based on standard ‘tests’. Each proposal within the submission version of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan will be assessed consistently using the framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA Objective</th>
<th>Assessment questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td>Will the option/proposal help to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect and enhance all biodiversity features.</td>
<td>• Support the status of the nationally and locally designated sites of significance within and/or adjacent to the Neighbourhood Plan area boundary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protect and enhance semi-natural habitats?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protect and enhance priority habitats, and the habitat of priority species?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Achieve a net gain in biodiversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support enhancements to multifunctional green infrastructure networks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support access to, interpretation and understanding of biodiversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate change</strong></td>
<td>Will the option/proposal help to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the contribution to climate change made by activities within the Neighbourhood Plan area</td>
<td>• Reduce the number of journeys made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce the need to travel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase the number of new developments meeting or exceeding sustainable design criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Generate energy from low or zero carbon sources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce energy consumption from non-renewable resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Objective</td>
<td>Assessment questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the resilience of the Neighbourhood Plan area to the potential effects of climate change, including flooding</td>
<td>Will the option/proposal help to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure that inappropriate development does not take place in areas at higher risk of flooding, taking into account the likely future effects of climate change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve and extend green infrastructure networks in the plan area to support adaptation to the potential effects of climate change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainably manage water run-off, reducing surface water runoff (either within the plan area or downstream)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure the potential risks associated with climate change are considered through new development in the Neighbourhood Plan area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase the resilience of biodiversity in the area to the effects of climate change, including through enhancements to ecological networks?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Will the option/proposal help to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect and enhance the character and quality of landscapes and townscapes.</td>
<td>• Conserve and enhance the natural beauty and special qualities of the South Norfolk and High Suffolk NCA, and the Special Landscape Area extending to the north and south of the town?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support the aims and objectives for shaping the future landscape of the LCAs which define the Neighbourhood Plan area, in accordance with the Joint Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council Landscape Guidance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conserve and enhance locally important landscape and townscape features within the Neighbourhood Plan area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conserve and enhance local diversity and character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protect locally important viewpoints contributing to the sense of place and visual amenity of the Neighbourhood Plan area?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Environment</th>
<th>Will the option/proposal help to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area</td>
<td>• Conserve and enhance the significance of buildings and structures of architectural or historic interest, both designated and non-designated, and their setting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conserve and enhance the special interest, character and appearance of locally important features and their settings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support the integrity of the historic setting of key buildings of cultural heritage interest as listed on the Suffolk HER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support access to, interpretation and understanding of the historic evolution and character of the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conserve and enhance archaeological remains, including historic landscapes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support the undertaking of archaeological investigations and, where appropriate, recommend mitigation strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Objective</td>
<td>Assessment questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Land, Soil and Water Resources** | **Ensure the efficient and effective use of land.** | Will the option/proposal help to:  
- Promote the use of previously developed land?  
- Avoid the development of the best and most versatile agricultural land, which in the parish may comprise Grade 2 and 3a agricultural land?  
| **Promote sustainable waste management solutions that encourage the reduction, re-use and recycling of waste.** | Will the option/proposal help to:  
- Reduce the amount of waste produced?  
- Support the minimisation, reuse and recycling of waste?  
- Maximise opportunities for local management of waste in order to minimise export of waste to areas outside?  
- Encourage recycling of materials and minimise consumption of resources during construction?  
| **Use and manage water resources in a sustainable manner.** | Will the option/proposal help to:  
- Support improvements to water quality?  
- Minimise water consumption?  
- Protect surface water resources?  |
| **Population and Community** | **Cater for existing and future residents’ needs as well as the needs of different groups in the community, and improve access to local, high-quality community services and facilities.** | Will the option/proposal help to:  
- Encourage and promote social cohesion and encourage active involvement of local people in community activities?  
- Minimise fuel poverty?  
- Maintain or enhance the quality of life of existing local residents?  
- Improve the availability and accessibility of key local facilities, including specialist services for disabled and older people?  
- Support the provision of land for allotments and cemeteries?  
| **Reduce deprivation and promote a more inclusive and self-contained community.** | |  
| **Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in good quality, affordable housing, and ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures.** | Will the option/proposal help to:  
- Support the provision of a range of house types and sizes?  
- Support enhancements to the current housing stock?  
- Meet the needs of all sectors of the community?  
- Provide quality and flexible homes that meet people’s needs?  
- Promote the use of sustainable building techniques, including use of sustainable building materials in construction?  
- Provide housing in sustainable locations that allow easy access to a range of local services and facilities?  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Health and Wellbeing</strong></th>
<th>Will the option/proposal help to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improve the health and wellbeing residents within the Neighbourhood Plan area. | - Promote accessibility to a range of leisure, health and community facilities, for all age groups?  
- Provide and enhance the provision of community access to green infrastructure, in accordance with Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards?  
- Promote the use of healthier modes of travel?  
- Improve access to the countryside for recreational use? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transportation</strong></th>
<th>Will the option/proposal help to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Promote sustainable transport use and reduce the need to travel. | - Encourage modal shift to more sustainable forms of travel?  
- Facilitate working from home and remote working?  
- Improve road safety?  
- Reduce the impact on residents from the road network? |
4. What has plan making / SEA involved to up to this point?

Introduction

4.1 The ‘narrative’ of plan-making / SEA up to this point is told within this part of the Environmental Report.

4.2 A key element of the SEA process is the appraisal of ‘reasonable alternatives’ for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan. The SEA Regulations\(^7\) are not prescriptive as to what constitutes a reasonable alternative, stating only that the Environmental Report should present an appraisal of the ‘plan and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan’.

4.3 In accordance with the SEA Regulations the Environmental Report must include...

- An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with; and
- The likely significant effects on the environment associated with alternatives / an outline of the reasons for selecting the preferred approach in light of alternatives appraised.

4.4 The following sections therefore describe how the SEA process to date has informed the preferred development strategy for the Neighbourhood Plan area and potential locations for development. Specifically, this chapter explains how the Eye Neighbourhood Plan’s development strategy has been shaped through considering alternative approaches for the location of housing in the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Overview of plan making / SEA work undertaken since 2017

4.5 The Eye Neighbourhood Plan area was designated by Mid Suffolk District Council in October 2017. Eye Town Council also established a steering group comprising of councillors and non-councillors in October 2017.

4.6 The Steering Group decided that it wished to engage local people in developing a vision for the future of Eye before consulting on detailed and specific proposals and policies. The Group developed a set of statements, which it used along with a range of questions on key issues, to engage the public in an initial consultation stage. The feedback from this consultation was used to develop an opportunity plan which identified key land use and other proposals. A second interim consultation stage was undertaken to validate the plan and proposals. The feedback at this stage was taken into account in developing a Pre-Submission draft Plan which was subject to public consultation between 8th November and 20th December 2018.

4.7 Additionally, AECOM were engaged through Government Technical Support to undertake an assessment of the suitability of sites for development, an assessment of the viability of sites for development (whether development would be profitable enough for the market to bring them forward) and an assessment of the number and type of houses required to meet local needs.

---

\(^7\) Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004
Housing numbers to deliver through the Neighbourhood Plan

4.8 The results of the various consultations completed to support the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan (see Supporting Documents SD4, SD20 and SD21) outline consistent views that the housing requirements within Eye should meet the following objectives:

- Directed primarily at meeting the needs of the younger population for affordable housing and the needs of an ageing population with smaller and/or specialist accommodation;
- In the form of smaller developments preferable within the town and not in the form of major expansions onto greenfield sites; and
- Supported with improvements to community infrastructure.

4.9 Regarding the amount of housing needed to meet the housing needs of Eye up to 2036 the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA)\(^8\) estimates that 164 dwellings will be required in total. The HNA also considered the housing mix (type and size) needed to meet current and future needs using current demographic data and household projections. To satisfy the requirements of increasingly smaller and older households, but also to enable younger households to remain in the area, 50% of new homes should be fewer than three bedrooms, and flats, bungalows and three-bedroom family homes would be appropriate to meet future needs. A survey of the housing needs within the Neighbourhood Plan area also suggested a 48% preference for houses, 29% for bungalows, 13.8% for flats and 9% for sheltered housing. Additionally, the HNA provided an estimate of the homes needed for the older population of the town over the plan period up to 2036. It estimates there will be an additional 258 residents aged 75+ during this time and a need for 65 additional specialist dwellings.

Assessment of reasonable alternatives for site allocations

4.10 To support the vision statements of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Steering Group were keen to consider alternative locations for delivering housing provision in the parish. Completed in June 2018, an independent and objective assessment of eleven potential sites was undertaken by AECOM. Eight sites were shortlisted from the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), with a further three sites put forward by Eye Town Council. See Supplementary Document SD5 for more details\(^9\).

4.11 To support the consideration of the suitability of these sites for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, the SEA process has undertaken an appraisal of the key environmental constraints present at each of the sites and potential effects that may arise because of development. In this context the sites have been considered in relation to the SEA Framework of objectives and decision-making questions developed during SEA scoping and the baseline information. This SEA site assessment was undertaken as a separate exercise to the Neighbourhood Plan site assessment.

4.12 The locations of the eleven sites assessed through the SEA process are presented in Figure 4.1 below. The site numbers and names have been taken from the site assessment (for consistency). Where the site has been put forward for an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, the name has been updated appropriately to match the name provided within the Plan.

---
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- Site Option

Site indicated on the north of Maple Way
Site no. 2 off the north of Maple Way
Site no. 3 off South of North Street
Site no. 4
Site no. 5 within the Village
Site no. 6 on the west of Eye Cemetery Stoney Road
Site no. 7 off Maple Way
Site no. 10 off Peter and St Paul Primary School
Site no. 11 off Eye High School
Site no. 12 off Badger Lane
Site no. 13 off Church Street
Site no. 14 off Woodside
Site no. 15 off Bothwell Road
Site no. 16 off Eye High School
Site no. 17 off Church Street
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SEA site assessment findings

4.13 The tables below present a summary of this assessment and provide an indication of each site’s sustainability performance in relation to the eight SEA themes.

Table 4.1: Site 1a ‘Land to the north of Maple Way (A)’

| Biodiversity | The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity and does not contain any BAP priority habitats. The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types. The site is an area of arable farmland and has a low biodiversity potential. There is a hedgerow located along the northern site boundary which connects to a small area of deciduous woodland BAP priority habitat located approximately 100m to the east of the site (at its nearest point). |
| Climate Change | In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, the site is not located within identified flood risk zones for fluvial flooding; the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1. The site has ‘very low’ susceptibility to surface water flooding. The site benefits from pedestrian links towards Eye town centre. An allocation at this location is therefore less likely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities, contributing to climate mitigation efforts. |
| Landscape | The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. However, the site is within a Special Landscape Area and is likely to be visible from important viewpoint 11 and viewpoint 12 within the Neighbourhood Plan area. |

---

10 Important viewpoints are classified and described through the Landscape and Visual Appraisal which is part of a series of supporting documents which form the evidence base for the Neighbourhood Plan.
## Historic Environment

The site does not contain and is not within the setting of a nationally designated heritage asset or the Eye Conservation Area. Likewise, the site does not overlap with an archaeological monument listed on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER), following a search of Suffolk Heritage Register’s interactive map in April 2019. There are three Grade II listed buildings located approximately 125m to the north west of the site (at its nearest point) which are likely to be screened from view by the hedgerow located along the northern site boundary. However, heritage was one of the three reasons why outline planning application ‘DC/18/05021’ for the erection of up to 126 dwellings and associated infrastructure on the site was refused by Mid Suffolk District Council in March 2019. Specifically, the decision notice states that although the development would likely cause less than substantial harm to nearby heritage assets, this harm was not considered to be sufficiently outweighed by the public benefits of the development.

## Land, Soil and Water Resources

A detailed agricultural land classification assessment has not been undertaken on the site. Based on the regional ALC maps, the whole of the site is underlain by a mix of Grade 2 (good) and Grade 3 (good to moderate) land. As the site is a greenfield location, development would not make the best use of previously developed land. The site is not within a groundwater source protection zone.

## Population and Community

Outline planning application ‘DC/18/05021’ for the erection of up to 126 dwellings and associated infrastructure (access to be considered) was refused by Mid Suffolk District Council in March 2019 for three reasons, summarised as follows: potential significant increase to traffic to local residential roads to the detriment of amenity of existing residents given the character of the existing road network; the site is within a Special Landscape Area and outside the settlement boundary of Eye; potential harm to nearby heritage assets, changing their rural setting and the experience of these assets.

## Health and Wellbeing

The ‘Mid Suffolk Footpath’ is located at the north eastern corner of the site. There is a local footpath adjacent to northern and western site boundaries which extends southwards and connects to the town centre, via Lambseth Street. There are several accessible local green spaces located to the west of the site, including: Oak Crescent Green, Langton House Orchard, and Century Road/Victoria Hill Junction Path. Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles through the availability and accessibility of these areas.

## Transportation

There is a potential to create access into the southern section of the site via Maple Way and into the western section of the site via Tuffs Road. However, these are currently ‘cul-de-sac’ residential roads which are likely only used for access to residential properties at these locations. The site benefits from pedestrian links into Eye town centre and is within proximity to bus stops located along Victoria Hill.

## Key

| Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures) | Likely positive effect |
| Neutral/no effect | Uncertain effects |

---

11 Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council (2019): ‘Planning Application DC/18/05021 – Decision Notice’, [online] available to access via: <https://planning.baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=PI6QXDSHGLL00> last accessed [30/04/19]
Table 4.2: Site 1b 'Land to the north of Maple Way (B)'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td>The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity and does not contain any BAP priority habitats. The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types. The site is an area of arable farmland and has a low biodiversity potential. There is a hedgerow located along the northern site boundary which connects to a small area of deciduous woodland BAP priority habitat located approximately 300m to the east of the site (at its nearest point).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change</strong></td>
<td>In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, the site is not located within identified flood risk zones for fluvial flooding; the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1. Most of the site has a 'very low' susceptibility to surface water flooding, however there is a corridor of land located adjacent to the northern site boundary which has a 'low' or 'medium' risk. Although the site is outside of the existing settlement, it benefits from pedestrian links towards Eye town centre. An allocation at this location is therefore less likely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities, contributing to climate mitigation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td>The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. However, the site is within a Special Landscape Area and is likely to be visible from important viewpoint 11 and viewpoint 12 within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic Environment
The site does not contain and is not within the setting of a nationally designated heritage asset or the Eye Conservation Area. Likewise, the site does not overlap with an archaeological monument listed on the Suffolk HER, following a search of Suffolk Heritage Register’s interactive map in April 2019.
There are three Grade II listed buildings located approximately 250m to the north west of the site (at its nearest point) which are likely to be screened from view by the hedgerow located along the northern site boundary.

Land, Soil and Water Resources
A detailed agricultural land classification assessment has not been undertaken on the site. Based on the regional ALC maps, the whole of the site is underlain by a mix of Grade 2 (good) and Grade 3 (good to moderate) land. This is likely to be land classified as the best and most versatile land for agricultural purposes. As the site is a greenfield location, development would not make the best use of previously developed land. The site is not within a groundwater source protection zone.

Population and Community
Outline planning application ‘DC/18/05021’ for the erection of up to 126 dwellings on land directly to the west of the site (Site 1a) was refused in March 2019 on grounds relating to its location outside of the settlement boundary and its setting within a Special Landscape Area. In this context, Site 1b is also outside of the existing settlement, with development in isolation to the town less likely to support the creation of a mixed, balanced and inclusive community within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Health and Wellbeing
The ‘Mid Suffolk Footpath’ is located at the north western corner of the site. There is a local footpath adjacent to northern and southern site boundaries which extends southwards and connects to the town centre, via Lambseth Street. There are several accessible local green spaces located to the west of the site, including: Oak Crescent Green, Langton House Orchard, and Century Road/Victoria Hill Junction Path. Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles through the availability and accessibility of these areas.

Transportation
There is no existing access into the site from the road network. Access would need to pass through the neighbouring site (Site 1a). The site does benefit from pedestrian links into Eye town centre and is within proximity to bus stops located along Victoria Hill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/no effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared for: Eye Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Table 4.3: Site 2 ‘Reserve Site south of Eye Airfield’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>There are a few hedgerow corridors within the boundaries of the site, with a group of trees located towards the north eastern boundary. These features should be retained and enhanced through development proposals. The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity and does not contain any BAP priority habitats. The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, the site is not located within identified flood risk zones for fluvial flooding; the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1. There are a few small sections of land within the western section of the site (primarily along tracks associated with the former airfield or adjacent to field boundaries) which have a ‘medium’ or ‘high’ susceptibility to surface water flooding. Development of the whole site will significantly increase the built-footprint of the town. Although the site is outside of the existing settlement, it benefits from pedestrian links towards Eye town centre. Therefore, the proximity of the site to the town centre will help limit the need to use privately-owned vehicles to access services and facilities within Eye, contributing to climate mitigation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. Land to the north east of the site is within a Special Landscape Area. Development of the whole of the site would be a noticeable change in character and expansion of the settlement to the north west. There are open and long views across the surrounding countryside. The site is likely to be visible from important viewpoint 14 within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Historic Environment**
The site does not contain and is not within the setting of a nationally designated heritage asset or the Eye Conservation Area. There is a Grade II listed building located to the north east of Langton Grove Farm (approximately 40m from the site at its nearest point). This heritage asset is less likely to be visible from the site due to screening provided by trees at its north eastern boundary. Listed on the Suffolk HER, Monument ID Eye 072 ‘Brome/Eye Airfield’ covers much of the site. Additionally, the HER shows three post-medieval pits towards the north eastern extent of the site. As such, the site could potentially contain below-ground archaeology.

**Land, Soil and Water Resources**
A detailed agricultural land classification assessment has not been undertaken on the site. Based on the regional ALC maps, the site is underlain by Grade 3 (good to moderate) land. As the site is a former airfield, development would make the best use of previously developed land. Due to its former use as an airfield, the site could contain contamination. There is a pond located within the north eastern section of the site. The western half of the site overlaps with groundwater source protection zones, namely: Zone II – Outer Protection Zone and Zone III – Total Catchment.

**Population and Community**
Development at this location in isolation would be detached from existing services and facilities in Eye, as it is outside of the existing settlement pattern of the town. However, outline planning application ‘3563/15’ for the erection of up to 280 dwellings and a 60-bed residential care home (with associated infrastructure) was granted in March 2018 on land directly to the south west of the site (Site 12). In this context, development at this location could positively contribute to the creation of a mixed, balanced and inclusive expansion of the community within the north western section of the town.

**Health and Wellbeing**
Part of the site is within a HSE Consultation Zone which places restrictions on the total number of residential dwellings allowed around the gas compression station at Eye Airfield (Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement - November 2013). Therefore, residential development is more suited to the southern section of the site, which the SHELAA indicating up to 360 dwellings on the 12 ha of land which this covers. There is a network of local footpaths passing through the site boundary which extend to the south west towards Eye town centre. Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles. A small area of land within the southern section of the site overlaps with the boundary of ‘The Meadow’ Local Green Space.

**Transportation**
There is the potential to establish access into the southern section of the site via Castleton Way and into the north eastern section of the site via Victoria Hill. Access to the local bus network is also possible along these roads. Although most of the site is not connected to the existing road network, there is the potential to establish access into the central sections of the site if the future development proposals on land directly to the south west of the site (Site 12) are delivered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures)</td>
<td>Likely positive effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/no effect</td>
<td>Uncertain effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4: Site 3 'Land north of Victoria Mill Allotments'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Land North of Victoria Mill Allotments</th>
<th>Site size: 1.29 ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td>The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity and does not contain any BAP priority habitats. There are hedgerows located along the northern, eastern and north western site boundaries which should be retained through development proposals. The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change</strong></td>
<td>In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, the site is not located within identified flood risk zones for fluvial flooding; the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1. Most of the site has a 'very low' susceptibility to surface water flooding. The site benefits from pedestrian links towards Eye town centre. An allocation at this location is therefore less likely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities, contributing to climate mitigation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td>The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. The SHELAA notes that there are open views across the surrounding countryside from the site. However, the site is not within a Special Landscape Area and is not likely to be visible from an important viewpoint within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Environment</strong></td>
<td>The site does not contain and is not within the setting of a nationally designated heritage asset or the Eye Conservation Area. Likewise, the site does not overlap with an archaeological monument listed on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER), following a search of Suffolk Heritage Register’s interactive map in April 2019. However, there are several archaeological monuments on the HER which are located/have been found on land immediately surrounding the site. As such, the site could potentially contain below-ground archaeology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, Soil and Water Resources</td>
<td>A detailed agricultural land classification assessment has not been undertaken on the site. Based on the regional ALC maps, the whole of the site is underlain by Grade 3 (good to moderate) land. As the site is a greenfield location, development would not make the best use of previously developed land. The whole of the site is within a groundwater source protection zone, namely: Zone II – Outer Protection Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and community</td>
<td>The site benefits from pedestrian links to Eye town centre, which is located approximately 750m to the south west and provides access to a variety of services and facilities. Likewise, Hartismere College, Hartismere School and Hospital are located to the south of the site along Castleton Way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellbeing</td>
<td>There is a local footpath passing alongside the eastern site boundary which extends to the south west and provides a pedestrian link to Eye town centre. The site is adjacent to two local green spaces, namely: The Meadow (to the north east) and Victoria Mill Allotments (to the south). Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles through the availability and accessibility of these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>In isolation, the site is not connected to the existing road network. However, there is the potential to establish access into the site if the future development proposals on land directly to the south west of the site (Site 12) are delivered. The site is within proximity to bus stops located along Castleton Way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

| Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures) | Likely positive effect |
| Neutral/no effect | Uncertain effects |
Table 4.5: Site 4 ‘Victoria Mill Allotments’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity</th>
<th>The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity and does not contain any BAP priority habitats. There are hedgerows located along the eastern, southern and western site boundaries which should be retained through development proposals. The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, the site is not located within identified flood risk zones for fluvial flooding; the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1. Most of the site has a 'very low' susceptibility to surface water flooding. The site benefits from pedestrian links towards Eye town centre. An allocation at this location is therefore less likely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities, contributing to climate mitigation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. The site is not within a Special Landscape Area and is not likely to be visible from an important viewpoint within the Neighbourhood Plan area. The existing vegetation along the eastern and western site boundaries provide natural screening of the site from the surrounding countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>The site does not contain and is not within the setting of a nationally designated heritage asset or the Eye Conservation Area. Listed on the Suffolk HER, Monument ID Eye 053 ‘Findspot of an Anglo-Saxon cruciform type brooch fragment’ partly overlaps with the western section of the site. There are several archaeological monuments on the HER which are located/have been found on land directly to the west of the site. As such, the site could potentially contain below-ground archaeology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, Soil and Water Resources</td>
<td>A detailed agricultural land classification assessment has not been undertaken on the site. Based on the regional ALC maps, the whole of the site is underlain by Grade 3 (good to moderate) land. As the site is a greenfield location, development would not make the best use of previously developed land. The whole of the site is within a groundwater source protection zone, namely: Zone II – Outer Protection Zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site: Victoria Mill Allotments

Site size: 1.33 ha
### Population and community

The site benefits from pedestrian links to Eye town centre, which is located approximately 750m to the south west. Development at this location would lead to the loss of established allotments which are a locally important community asset and designated as a local green space. Therefore, appropriate alternative provision of allotments should be delivered prior to allocating the site for residential development.

### Health and wellbeing

There is a local footpath passing alongside the eastern site boundary which extends to the south west and provides a pedestrian link to Eye town centre. Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles. Hartismere College, Hartismere School and Hartismere Hospital are located to the south of the site along Castleton Way. However, a residential allocation would lead to the loss of the Victoria Mill Allotments Local Green Space in the absence of appropriate mitigation.

### Transportation

Access into the southern section of the site is possible via Millfield. There is the potential to establish access into the eastern and western sections of the site if the future development proposals on the neighbouring land (Site 12) are delivered. The site is within proximity to bus stops located along Castleton Way.

### Key

| Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures) | Likely positive effect |
| Neutral/no effect | Uncertain effects |
Table 4.6: Site 7 ‘Land west of Eye Cemetery, Yaxley Road’

| Biodiversity | The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity. There is a corridor of trees located along the western and eastern site boundaries which should be retained through development proposals. There is an area of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh BAP priority habitat located directly to the north of the site. The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types. |
| Climate Change | In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, the site is not located within identified flood risk zones for fluvial flooding; the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1. However, land directly to the north of the site is within Flood Zone 2 and 3, with most of this land having a ‘medium’ or ‘high’ surface water flood risk. Although the site is outside of the existing settlement, it benefits from pedestrian links towards Eye town centre. An allocation at this location is therefore less likely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities, contributing to climate mitigation efforts. |
| Landscape | The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. Land located directly to the north east of the site is within a Special Landscape Area. The site is located directly to the west of important viewpoint 6 within the Neighbourhood Plan area. |
| Historic Environment | The site does not contain and is not within the setting of a nationally designated heritage asset or the Eye Conservation Area. Likewise, the site does not overlap with an archaeological monument listed on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER), following a search of Suffolk Heritage Register’s interactive map in April 2019. However, there are several archaeological monuments on the HER which are located/have been found on land immediately to the east and west of the site including EYE 054 ‘Rapsy Tapsy Lane’, EYE 046 ‘Hospital of St Mary Magdalen’ and EYE 137 ‘Eye Cemetery’. As such, the site could potentially contain below-ground archaeology. |
Land, Soil and Water Resources

The northern site boundary is adjacent to a tributary of the River Dove. A detailed agricultural land classification assessment has not been undertaken on the site. Based on the regional ALC maps, most of the site is underlain by Grade 3 (good to moderate) land, with a corridor of land adjacent to the southern site boundary underlain by Grade 2 (good) land. As the site is a greenfield location, development would not make the best use of previously developed land. The whole of the site is within a groundwater source protection zone, namely: Zone II – Outer Protection Zone.

Population and community

The site is adjacent to an existing cemetery. Following a high-level search of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council’s interactive planning application map in April 2019, there have been no applications for residential development at this location within the last five years. The site is outside of the existing settlement of Eye.

The site benefits from pedestrian links to Eye town centre (along PRoW located adjacent to the northern site boundary), which is approximately 1km to the east of the site. Hartismere College, Hartismere School and Hartismere Hospital are located approximately 1km to the north east of the site along Castleton Way.

Health and wellbeing

The site is within proximity to three local green spaces, namely: Rapsy Tapsy Lane (adjacent to the western site boundary), Eye Cemetery (adjacent to the eastern site boundary) and Hartismere School Playing Field (north east of site). Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles through the availability of these areas within proximity to the site.

Transportation

Access into the site is currently not possible. However, there is the potential to establish access into the southern section of the site via the B1117 (Yaxley Road). Access to local bus networks is possible in Eye town centre, with the nearest bus stop to the site located along Magdalen Street (approximately 750m to the east). As the site is located outside of the existing settlement it is therefore less accessible on foot.

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures)</th>
<th>Likely positive effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/no effect</td>
<td>Uncertain effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7: Site 9 'The Chicken Factory area'

The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity. There is an area of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh BAP priority habitat located directly to the north of the site and a corridor of deciduous woodland BAP priority habitat passing through the centre of the site. This area of woodland connects to a larger area of woodland located directly to the north of the site. The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types.

In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, the Greenfield areas of the site (western half) are within Flood Zone 2 and 3, and therefore have a high flood risk potential. Likewise, most of this land has a ‘medium’ or ‘high’ surface water flood risk.

The site benefits from pedestrian links to Eye town centre. An allocation at this location is therefore less likely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities, contributing to climate mitigation efforts.

The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. The greenfield sections of the site are within a Special Landscape Area. The site is likely to be visible from important viewpoint 3, viewpoint 4, viewpoint 7 and viewpoint 8 within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

The site is adjacent to four listed buildings which are located along Magdalen Street, all of which are within or within the setting of the Eye Conservation Area. These heritage assets are less likely to be visible from the site as they are surrounded by trees. Development at this location has the potential to positively contribute to the wider setting of the Eye Conservation Area (approaching from Magdalen Street), providing that the development has a high quality and sensitive design which incorporates measures to enhance the special qualities of the heritage asset.

Listed on the Suffolk HER, Monument ID EYE 067 'Eye Railway Station' and EYE 135 'Eye Railway Branch' are recorded within the built-up area of the site. As such, the site could potentially contain below-ground archaeology.
### Land, Soil and Water Resources

The northern site boundary is adjacent to a tributary of the River Dove. Due to the existing poultry use and former railway-related uses, the site could contain contaminated land. Development within the eastern half of the site will promote the best and most efficient use of previously developed land.

A detailed agricultural land classification assessment has not been undertaken on the site. Based on the regional ALC maps, most of the greenfield area of the site is underlain by Grade 3 (good to moderate) land, with a corridor of land adjacent to the southern site boundary underlain by Grade 2 (good) land. However, the site is not currently utilised for agricultural purposes.

The whole of the site is within a groundwater source protection zone, namely: Zone I – Inner Protection Zone.

### Population and Community

Following a high-level search of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council’s interactive planning application map, there have been no applications for residential development at this location within the last five years. However, change of use application ‘1891/16’ to provide an 81-space car park (primarily for employees of the poultry processing factory) in the south western section of the site was approved with conditions in September 2016.

Hartismere College, Hartismere School and Hartismere Hospital are located approximately 500m to the north west of the site along Castleton Way.

### Health and Wellbeing

The site is within proximity to two local green spaces, namely: Town Moors Woodland (adjacent to the southern site boundary) and The Rettery (adjacent to the northern site boundary). There are two other local green spaces within walking distance from the site, namely: Town Moors Playing Field (south east of site) and Rettery Allotments (north east of site). Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles through the availability and accessibility of these areas.

### Transportation

Access into the southern section of the site is achievable from the existing road network, via a turning from Magdalen Street. There is a bus stop located adjacent to the southern site boundary connecting the site to the local public transport network. The site benefits from pedestrian links into Eye town centre, which is approximately 200m to the east.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures)</th>
<th>Likely positive effect</th>
<th>Neutral/no effect</th>
<th>Uncertain effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 4.8: Site 10 ‘St Peter and St Paul Primary School

Site: St Peter and St Paul Primary School

Site size: 1.09ha

Biodiversity
The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity. There is an area of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh BAP priority habitat located adjacent to the north eastern boundary of the site. There is an area of deciduous woodland BAP priority habitat located to the south of the site, on the other side of Hoxne Road (B1117). Development is unlikely to impact this habitat. The site is approximately 100m to the north of ‘The Pennings’ Local Nature Reserve (at its nearest point). The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types.

Climate Change
In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, areas of land within the north western section and south eastern section of the site are within Flood Zone 2 and therefore have a high flood risk potential. These areas of the site have a ‘low’ surface water flood risk, with the remaining sections of the site having a ‘very low’ risk. The site benefits from pedestrian links to Eye town centre. An allocation at this location is therefore unlikely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities, contributing to climate mitigation efforts.

Landscape
The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. The site is within a Special Landscape Area and is likely to be visible from important viewpoint 1 within the Neighbourhood Plan area. However, site benefits from natural screening by the trees located along its boundaries.

Historic Environment
The south western section of the site is within the boundary of the Eye Conservation Area, with the remaining sections of the site located directly adjacent to this heritage asset. On land surrounding the southern boundary off the site, there are two Grade I, one Grade II* and three Grade II nationally designated listed buildings, including the Church of St Peter and St Paul which is also listed on the Suffolk HER. The SHELAA states that there are also prominent views to and from Eye Castle, which is a scheduled monument.
### Land, Soil and Water Resources
The northern site boundary is adjacent to a tributary of the River Dove. Development of the brownfield sections of the site will promote the best and most efficient use of land. A detailed agricultural land classification assessment has not been undertaken on the site. Based on the regional ALC maps, the greenfield areas of the site are underlain by Grade 3 (good to moderate) land. However, the land is not currently utilised for agricultural purposes. The site is not within a groundwater source protection zone.

### Population and Community
Following a high-level search of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council’s interactive planning application map in April 2019, there have been no applications for residential development at this location within the last five years. The site is currently used for a school. Therefore, a residential allocation at this location is only appropriate if suitable alternative provisions can be made elsewhere. The site is within walking distance from local services and facilities in Eye town centre.

### Health and Wellbeing
The site is within proximity to six additional local green spaces, including Eye Castle and Meadow, St Peter and St Paul Churchyard, The Pennings Local Nature Reserve and Abbey Bridge Meadow. Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles through the availability and accessibility of these areas. However, a residential allocation at this location would potentially lead to the loss of the Primary School Playing Field Local Green Space in the absence of appropriate mitigation.

### Transportation
Access into the southern section of the site is achievable from the existing road network, via a turning from Church Street. There is a bus stop located adjacent to the southern site boundary connecting the site to the local public transport network.

### Key
| Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures) | Likely positive effect |
| Neutral/no effect | Uncertain effects |
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### Table 4.9: Site 11 ‘Land at Eye Health Centre and Hartismere Health and Care’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity</th>
<th>The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity. There is an area of deciduous woodland BAP priority habitat located to the south of the site. The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, the site is not located within identified flood risk zones for fluvial flooding; the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1. There is a small area of land in the central section of the site which has a 'medium' risk of surface water flooding, but most of the site has a 'very low' surface water flood risk. The site benefits from pedestrian links to Eye town centre. An allocation at this location is therefore less likely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities, contributing to climate mitigation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. Land to the south west of the site is within a Special Landscape Area. Designated for their amenity interest, the SHELAA states that there are TPOs located along the southern site boundary which should be retained through development proposals. The site is not likely to be visible from an important viewpoint within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>The site does not contain and is not within the setting of a nationally designated heritage asset. There are two Grade II listed buildings located approximately 150m to the east of the site (at its nearest point). Eye Conservation Area is located approximately 200m to the east of the site, along Lambseth Street. However, these heritage assets are not likely to be visible from the site due to screening from trees and buildings along Daniel Gardens. Listed on the Suffolk HER, Monument ID EYE 062 ‘Hartismere Hospital, Poor Law Institution’ is located within the western section of the site. As such, the site could potentially contain below-ground archaeology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land, Soil and Water Resources
Development at this location would promote the best and most efficient use of previously developed land. The SHELAA states that planning application ‘2477/12’ for the demolition of one of the hospital buildings and the use of this space for car parking was granted in September 2012. The building has since been demolished but the land it was on has not been built on yet for a car park and remains empty.
Due to the existing and former use of the land, the site could contain contaminated land. The whole of the site overlaps with groundwater source protection zones, namely: Zone I – Inner Protection Zone and Zone II – Outer Protection Zone.

Population and community
Following a high-level search of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council’s interactive planning application map in April 2019, there have been no applications for residential development at this location within the last five years. The site is currently used as a hospital and police station and therefore, a residential allocation at this location is less appropriate unless suitable alternative provisions can be made in this regard. However, the SHELAA outlines that opportunities exist to consolidate some of the hospital uses and redevelop areas of the site for housing. The site is within proximity to Eye town centre.

Health and wellbeing
The site is within proximity to several local green spaces including Victoria Mill Allotments, Victoria Windmill, Hartismere School Playing Fields, The Rettery, and Rettery Allotments. Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles through the availability and accessibility of these areas.
However, a residential allocation at this location could potentially lead to the loss of the Hartismere Hospital Roadside Meadow Local Green Space which is located within the northern section of the site, in the absence of appropriate mitigation.

Transportation
Access into the northern section of the site is achievable from the existing road network, via a turning from Castleton Way. There is a bus stop located adjacent to the northern site boundary connecting the site to the local public transport network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures)</td>
<td>Likely positive effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/no effect</td>
<td>Uncertain effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10: Site 12 ‘Land south of Eye Airfield’

Site size: 28.70 ha

**Biodiversity**

There are a few hedgerow corridors within the boundaries of the site which should be retained through development proposals. The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity. There are areas of deciduous woodland BAP priority habitat located directly to the east of the site between Victoria Hill (B1077) and Langton Lodge. The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types.

**Climate Change**

In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, the site is not located within identified flood risk zones for fluvial flooding; the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1. There is a corridor of land passing alongside one of the central field boundaries and the western site boundary which contains areas of land which have a ‘medium’ or ‘high’ susceptibility to surface water flooding. Development of the whole site will significantly increase the built-footprint of the town and could potentially increase the surface water flood risk potential on land within and adjacent to the site boundary.

The site benefits from pedestrian links to Eye town centre. An allocation at this location is therefore less likely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities, contributing to climate mitigation efforts.

**Landscape**

The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. The site is not within a Special Landscape Area. However, development of the whole of the site would be a noticeable change in character and expansion of the settlement to the north west. Although there are open and long views across the surrounding countryside, the site is not likely to be visible from an important viewpoint within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
**Historic Environment**
The site does not contain and is not within the setting of a nationally designated heritage asset or the Eye Conservation Area. There are five Grade II listed buildings located to the east of Langton Grove Farm (approximately 50m from the site at its nearest point). These heritage assets are less likely to be visible from the site due to screening provided by trees and buildings which surround them. There are several archaeological monuments on the Suffolk HER which are located/have been found on the site, including Roman, Medieval and Post-mediaval features, an Iron Age trackway and an Anglo-Saxon cemetery. As such, the site could potentially contain below-ground archaeology.

**Land, Soil and Water Resources**
A detailed agricultural land classification assessment has not been undertaken on the site. Based on the regional ALC maps, the whole of the site is underlain by Grade 3 (good to moderate) land. As the site is a former airfield, development would make the best use of previously developed land. Due to its former use, the site could contain contamination. Areas of land within the southern and western sections of the site overlaps with groundwater source protection zones, namely: Zone II – Outer Protection Zone and Zone III – Total Catchment.

**Population and community**
Outline planning application ‘3563/15’ for the erection of up to 280 dwellings and a 60-bed residential care home (with associated infrastructure) was granted in March 2018 on the site, subject to a variety of planning conditions (further discussed within Chapter 5 of the Environmental Report). The site benefits from pedestrian links to Eye town centre and is also located within proximity to Hartismere College, Hartismere School and Hartismere Hospital along Castleton Way.

**Health and wellbeing**
Part of the site is within an HSE Consultation Zone which places restrictions on the total number of residential dwellings allowed (stated within the Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement, November 2013). Therefore, development within the southern and eastern sections of the site are most appropriate in this regard. There is a network of local footpaths passing through the site boundary which extend to the south west towards Eye town centre. Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles. An area of land within the central section of the site overlaps with the boundary of ‘The Meadow’ Local Green Space, however this is likely to be retained and enhanced through the conditions within the decision notice for planning application ‘3563/15’.

**Transportation**
There is the potential to establish access into the southern section of the site via Haygate and into the north eastern section of the site via a turning from Victoria Hill, passing alongside Langton Grove Farm. Conditions 27 to 33 within the decision notice for planning application ‘3563/15’ outline a variety of actions relating to highway design, safety and traffic management associated with the development proposals for this site. The site is within proximity to bus stops located along Castleton Way.

**Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures)</th>
<th>Likely positive effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/no effect</td>
<td>Uncertain effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 4.11: Site 13 ‘Paddock House, Church Street’**

<p>| <strong>Biodiversity</strong> | The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity and is not within proximity to any BAP priority habitats. The site does not overlap with a SSSI IRZ for residential, rural residential or rural non-residential development types. |
| <strong>Climate Change</strong> | In relation to adapting to the effects of climate change, the site is not located within identified flood risk zones for fluvial flooding; the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1. There are areas of land along Wellington Road, immediately adjacent to the northern and north eastern site boundaries of the site, which have a ‘high’ surface water flood risk. The site benefits from pedestrian links to Eye town centre. An allocation at this location is therefore less likely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities, contributing to climate mitigation efforts. |
| <strong>Landscape</strong> | The site does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. The site is not within a Special Landscape Area and is not likely to be visible from an important viewpoint within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Nonetheless, regeneration of the site presents an opportunity to enhance the quality and character of the local townscape. |
| <strong>Historic Environment</strong> | There are several Grade II listed buildings surrounding the site, primarily located along Church Street, Dove Lane and Wellington Road. Likewise, the whole of the site is within the Eye Conservation Area. Development at this location has the potential to positively contribute to the wider setting of the Eye Conservation Area, providing that the development has a high quality and sensitive design which incorporates measures to enhance the special qualities of the heritage asset. The site does not overlap with an archaeological monument listed on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER), following a search of Suffolk Heritage Register’s interactive map in April 2019. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land, Soil and Water Resources</strong></th>
<th>The site is an existing area of brownfield land containing a derelict building and therefore, development at this location would promote the best and most efficient use of underutilised land. The site is not within a groundwater source protection zone.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and community</strong></td>
<td>The site benefits from pedestrian links to Eye town centre and is also located within proximity to local services and facilities. Redevelopment of the site has the potential to facilitate positive improvements to the public realm providing that the proposals incorporate high quality and sensitive design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and wellbeing</strong></td>
<td>The site is within proximity to several local green spaces, including Eye Castle and Meadow, St Peter and St Paul Churchyard, Eye Scout Hut and Lemsey Beck Field (east and west). Development at this location has the potential to encourage active lifestyles through the availability and accessibility of these areas. However, a residential allocation at this location would potentially lead to the loss of Paddock House Roadside Meadow Local Green Space in the absence of appropriate mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>Access into the southern section of the site is achievable from the existing road network, via Church Street. The site benefits from a central location within Eye town centre and is within proximity to bus stops located along the B1077.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current approach in the Neighbourhood Plan and the development of Neighbourhood Plan policies

Current approach in the Neighbourhood Plan

4.14 The Local Plan identifies Eye is a ‘Market Town’ which is identified as being located within a ‘functional cluster’ of settlements that have the potential to accommodate more than its own housing needs. The spatial distribution and total number of dwellings within each settlement has yet to be determined by Mid Suffolk District Council.

4.15 Outline planning permission has already been granted on land South of Eye Airfield for 280 dwellings and a 60-place residential home. Whilst this surpasses the HNA target of 164 dwellings for the town, the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that the proposals are not likely to meet the affordable housing and specialist housing requirements within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Therefore, the proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area are not only based on delivering a target number of new dwellings but are also intended to meet specific housing requirements and/or other objectives for the local community.

4.16 In this context, the Neighbourhood Plan is proposing to take forward six sites for residential allocations which will deliver a total of 519 dwellings during the plan period. Listed within Policy Eye 1 ‘Housing Allocations’ in the Neighbourhood Plan, the sites are as follows:

- Site 3: Land north of Victoria Mill Allotments (34 dwellings);
- Site 4: Victoria Mill Allotments (72 dwellings);
- Site 9: The Chicken Factory Area (78 dwellings);
- Site 11: Eye Health Centre and Hartismere Health and Care (43 dwellings);
- Site 12: Land South of Eye Airfield (280 dwellings and a 60-place care home); as per planning application ‘3563/15’ and
- Site 13: Paddock House, Church Street (12 dwellings).

4.17 The allocations above will be accompanied by 60 dwellings through windfall sites and proposals for a crematorium (Site 7), parking areas, an aspirational policy for new residential development (Site 10) and a reserved site for future expansion in the longer term of around 174 dwellings on Site 2: Reserve Site South of Eye Airfield, and a new primary school/sports centre expansion on land directly to the west and south (respectively) of the Hartismere High School.

Neighbourhood Plan policies

4.18 To support the implementation of the vision statements for the Neighbourhood Plan, the submission version of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan puts forward 35 policies to guide new development within the Neighbourhood Plan area. These were developed following extensive community consultation and evidence gathering and are listed below in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Eye Neighbourhood Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye 1</td>
<td>Housing Allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 2</td>
<td>Form of Affordable Housing Provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye 3</td>
<td>Land South of Eye Airfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 4</td>
<td>Land at Eye Health Centre and Hartismere Health and Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 5</td>
<td>Paddock House, Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 6</td>
<td>Land North of Victoria Mill Allotments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 7</td>
<td>Victoria Mill Allotments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 8 (Aspirational)</td>
<td>St Peter and St Paul Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 9</td>
<td>Reserve Site South of Airfield, Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 10</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the Chicken Factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 11</td>
<td>Public Car Parking at the Rettery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 12</td>
<td>Cycle Parking in Public Car Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 13</td>
<td>Crematorium, Land West of Eye Cemetery, Yaxley Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 14</td>
<td>Land for Primary School, West of Hartismere High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 15</td>
<td>Sports Hall and related uses at Hartismere High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 16</td>
<td>Development outside the Settlement Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 17</td>
<td>Development within the Settlement Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 18</td>
<td>Special Landscape Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 19</td>
<td>Managing Change in the Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 20</td>
<td>Visually Important Open Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 21</td>
<td>Local Green Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 22</td>
<td>Biodiversity Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 23</td>
<td>Eye District Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 24</td>
<td>Uses Appropriate for the District Shopping Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 25</td>
<td>Shop Front Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 26</td>
<td>Retaining Traditional Shop Fronts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 27 (Non-Planning)</td>
<td>Management of Public Car Parking Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 28</td>
<td>Public Rights of Way West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 29</td>
<td>Public Rights of Way East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 30</td>
<td>Improvement of Public Rights of Way (PRoW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 31</td>
<td>Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 32</td>
<td>Electric Vehicle Charging in New Public Car Parking Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 33</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 34</td>
<td>Eye Business Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye 35</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. What are the appraisal findings at this current stage?

Introduction

5.1 The aim of this chapter is to present appraisal findings and recommendations in relation to the submission version of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan. This chapter presents:

- An appraisal of the current version of the Neighbourhood Plan under the eight SEA theme headings; and
- The overall conclusions at this current stage and recommendations for the next stage of plan-making.

Approach to the appraisal

5.2 The appraisal is structured under the eight SEA themes taken forward for the purposes of the SEA.

5.3 For each theme, ‘significant effects’ of the current version of the plan on the baseline are predicted and evaluated. Account is taken of the criteria presented within Schedule 2 of the Regulations. So, for example, account is taken of the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of effects as far as possible. These effect ‘characteristics’ are described within the assessment as appropriate.

5.4 Every effort is made to identify / evaluate effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the high-level nature of the plan. The ability to predict effects accurately is also limited by understanding of the baseline and the nature of future planning applications. Because of the uncertainties involved, there is a need to exercise caution when identifying and evaluating significant effects and ensure all assumptions are explained. In many instances it is not possible to predict significant effects, but it is possible to comment on merits (or otherwise) in more general terms.

Biodiversity

5.5 The Neighbourhood Plan area is relatively unconstrained in biodiversity terms and does not overlap with the boundaries of any European or nationally designated sites. Although the ‘Major Farm, Braiseworth’ SSSI is located directly adjacent to its western boundary, the Neighbourhood Plan area is not located within a SSSI IRZ for the type of development proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan area (i.e. residential, rural residential, or rural non-residential). Therefore, the proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan are not likely to lead to significant effects in relation to biodiversity. However, whilst no significant negative effects on biodiversity can be readily identified, there will be a need for potential effects on biodiversity linked to the proposed allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan to be avoided and mitigated. Therefore, the Neighbourhood Plan sets outs provisions which will 1) help limit potential effects from new development on features and areas of biodiversity interest in the Neighbourhood Plan area and 2) support the resilience of ecological networks.

5.6 For example, Policy Eye 22 ‘Biodiversity Networks’ states that development proposals should retain and enhance habitats and improve ecological connectivity to create biodiversity networks with the surrounding landscape. Additionally, Policy Eye 19 ‘Managing Change in the Landscape’ suggests that development should complement the pattern and distribution of woodland, meadowland and hedgerows. Concerning the residential allocation through Policy Eye 3 ‘Land
South of Eye Airfield, there are various planning conditions attached to the outline permission which will further support the resilience of ecological networks, including:

- Condition 8 states that the development shall be implemented and completed in the interests of the adequate safeguarding of biodiversity and ecology;
- Condition 13 states that any vegetation to be affected by any proposed lighting shall be illuminated to a level no greater than 1 lux (strong moonlight) in order to reduce the impact to nocturnal species; and
- Condition 19 states that any trees, shrubs or hedgerows located within or at the boundary of the development area shall be protected in accordance with a scheme of tree protection.

This is further supported by the various mitigation measures shown within the illustrative masterplan for the development (Figure 2 within the Neighbourhood Plan), which includes a proposed tree belt and potential attenuation ponds.

Published in July 2018, paragraph 170 (d) within the revised NPPF states that 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’, with paragraph 32 outlining that spatial development strategies should demonstrate how opportunities for net gains have been addressed. An environmental net gain principle for development is also embedded within the goals and policies of the UK Government’s 25-Year Environment Plan, which was published in January 2018. In this regard, Policy Eye 22 confirms that development proposals should deliver measurable, proportionate and appropriate biodiversity net gain.

Ecological networks within the Neighbourhood Plan area are further supported by policies which safeguard open spaces. Policy Eye 21 ‘Local Green Spaces’ states that proposals for development within these areas will only be permitted in very special circumstances and if their value can be replaced in another location. The protection of these spaces will bolster locally important areas of Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitats in Eye against potential threats from development, by maintaining the availability of connectivity corridors and stepping stones between them. Similarly, the provisions of Policy Eye 22 will further support the integrity of these areas considering that many of the proposed allocations are located directly adjacent/within proximity to one or multiple local green spaces.

**Climate Change**

In terms of climate change mitigation, road transport is an increasingly significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in the Neighbourhood Plan area. Based on the 2011 census data, the most popular method of travelling to work in the Neighbourhood Plan area is via driving, with 84.0% of residents having access to at least one car or van. Supporting modal shift, Policy Eye 17 ‘Development within the Settlement Boundary’ will support a limitation of greenhouse gas emissions in Eye by encouraging alternative options of transportation, particularly for undertaking day-to-day activities. Specifically, to encourage cycling, cycle parking will be required for new developments (where possible) which at least meet the standards set out in the Suffolk guidance for parking. As the proposed allocations are within the vicinity of the town, this will also support lower carbon modes of transport.

Policy Eye 31 ‘Electric Vehicle Charging in Development’ states that all new developments will be required to incorporate one point per dwelling for all dwellings which include off-street parking. Policy Eye 31 also outlines provisions for new commercial and retail developments

---

which come forward within the Neighbourhood Plan area, with Policy Eye 32 ‘Electric Vehicle Charging in New Public Car Parking Spaces’ suggesting that 10% of spaces should provide electric charging points. Furthermore, the proposed allocations through Policy Eye 5 ‘Paddock House, Church Street’ (Site 13) and Policy Eye 10 ‘Redevelopment of the Chicken Factory’ (Site 9) encourage pedestrian routes and links to surrounding areas.

5.12 In terms of climate change adaptation, the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework will help address potential flood risk issues in the Neighbourhood Plan area. Five out of the six proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan are located within Flood Zone 1 and therefore have a ‘low’ flood risk potential. However, Policy Eye 10 ‘Redevelopment of the Chicken Factory’ (Site 9) is partly located within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3, with these areas defined by the Environment Agency as land with ‘medium’ and ‘high’ risk of flooding. As such, Policy Eye 10 (point D) states that a flood risk assessment applying the sequential test should be undertaken before planning permission is granted. Policy Eye 17 goes onto state that proposals should take account of flood risk from all sources and development should not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

5.13 Additionally, Policy Eye 21 ‘Local Green Spaces’ and Policy Eye 22 ‘Biodiversity Networks’ support the protection of open spaces and habitats within the Neighbourhood Plan area. This will safeguard natural carbon sequesters located within the landscape (i.e. trees and hedgerows) and will also positively respond to the potential effects of climate change (particularly from extreme weather events) through providing summer shading and reducing surface water run-off.

**Landscape**

5.14 The Neighbourhood Plan area does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or AONB and does not contain any Green Belt land. However, the Neighbourhood Plan has a strong focus on protecting the sense of place and special qualities of Eye which contribute to its character and respect its setting within the locally designated Special Landscape Area. For example, Policy 18 ‘Special Landscape Area’ states that development proposals within or adjacent to the Eye Special Landscape Area will be resisted unless the potential significant adverse impacts to its character and special qualities can be satisfactorily mitigated. Policy Eye 19 ‘Managing Change in the Landscape’ affirms that development proposals should maintain and enhance the character of the landscape in which they are set, complementing the historic pattern of enclosure and the distribution of woodland, meadowland and hedgerows. Likewise, Policy Eye 16 ‘Development outside of the Settlement Boundary’ suggests that proposals which are outside of town will be resisted unless they represent appropriate uses within the countryside. These policies will ensure that new developments within the Neighbourhood Plan area are sensitive to their setting and safeguard important features from high levels of inappropriate development.

5.15 It is important to note that five of the six proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area are not within the Eye Special Landscape Area. However, the greenfield areas of Site 9 ‘The Chicken Factory Area’ (see Policy Eye 10) are within its boundary. This is acknowledged within Policy Eye 10 which confirms that substantial landscaping of the planned car park at this location (as per the provisions of the change of use planning application ‘1891/16’) will be required.

5.16 With reference to the residential allocation of Site 12 ‘Land South of Eye Airfield’ (see Policy Eye 3), development at this location would result in a significant expansion of the settlement into the north western section of the Neighbourhood Plan area. As such, there are various planning conditions attached to the outline permission which aim to safeguard the open landscape from inappropriate levels of development, including:

- Condition 11 states that a soft landscaping scheme will be implemented in accordance with the approved design in the interests of visual amenity, character and appearance;
Condition 13 states that any vegetation to be affected by any proposed lighting shall be illuminated to a level no greater than 1 lux (strong moonlight) in the interest of amenity to reduce the impact of night time illumination; and

Condition 20 states that a landscape management plan will be submitted to the local planning authority for approval, which will include long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas.

5.17 Completed to support the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Landscape and Visual Assessment identifies and describes 14 locally important viewpoints within Eye which are considered to represent the principal views towards the settlement from the surrounding lanes and public rights of way (PRoW). Although most of the proposed allocations are unlikely to be visible from an important viewpoint, Site 9 ‘The Chicken Factory Area’ (see Policy Eye 10) is potentially visible from four of them. In this regard, Policy Eye 20 ‘Visually Important Open Spaces’ confirms that within or abutting settlement boundaries, visually important open spaces will be protected because of their contribution to character or appearance of their surroundings and their amenity value to the local community. Policy Eye 20 goes on to state that where appropriate, development proposals must demonstrate that they will not significant impact upon the views.

5.18 Similarly, Policy Eye 17 ‘Development within the Settlement Boundary’ affirms that all development proposals are expected to contribute to and enhance, where appropriate, the local distinctiveness of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan area. Specifically, point G of Policy Eye 17 states that all new development should demonstrate a clear understanding of the rural context of Eye, providing appropriate levels of landscaping, boundary and screening planting. Therefore, these policies take a pro-active and positive approach to protecting and enhancing the distinctive character and visual amenity of the Neighbourhood Plan area.

**Historic Environment**

5.19 The Neighbourhood Plan area has a rich historic environment, recognised through the diversity of features and areas that are nationally and locally valued for their cultural heritage interest, including three Grade I, seven Grade II* and 154 Grade II listed buildings, along with eight scheduled monuments and the Eye Conservation Area. This is reflected by Neighbourhood Plan policies which have a strong focus on conserving and enhancing the significance of buildings and structures of architectural or historic interest, both designated and non-designated, and their settings.

5.20 For example, Policy Eye 17 ‘Development within the Settlement Boundary’ acknowledges the value of Eye’s ‘island’ setting and heritage, requiring proposals to incorporate high-quality, sustainable and inclusive design and architecture that respects the conservation area. Policy Eye 17 also contains several criteria which aim to conserve and enhance the historic significance of the Neighbourhood Plan area’s heritage assets, contributing to local distinctiveness, their setting and sense of place. Additionally, Policy Eye 20 ‘Visually Important Open Spaces’ suggests that development proposals must not significantly impact the views of the conservation area. Policy Eye 25 ‘Shop Front Design’ states that special attention should be given to the design, colour, materials and detailing of these features within the conservation area. Similarly, Policy Eye 26 ‘Retaining Traditional Shop Fronts’ aiming to safeguard fronts of merit, particularly those which adjoin a listed building.

5.21 In the context of the above, one of the six proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan is within the Eye Conservation Area and within the setting of a few listed buildings. However, the site in question (see Policy Eye 5 ‘Paddock House, Church Street’) is an existing area of brownfield land containing a derelict building. Therefore, regenerating the site could positively enhance the wider setting of these heritage assets providing that the development has a high
quality and sensitive design which incorporates measures to enhance their special qualities. This is supported through the provisions of Policy Eye 17 and Policy Eye 20.

5.22 It should be noted that not all the area’s historic environment features are subject to statutory designations, and non-designated features comprise a large part of what people have contact with as part of daily life – whether at home, work or leisure. Although not designated, many buildings and areas are of historic interest and are important by local communities. In this regard, the Historic Environmental Record for Suffolk contains 154 listings within the Neighbourhood Plan area, including Anglo-Saxon artefacts and archaeological finds dating to the Bronze Age, Neolithic period, Mesolithic period and Roman period. Notably, five out of the six proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan have the potential to contain archaeological remains and/or findings, acknowledged within the policies. Specifically, Policy Eye 4 ‘Land at Eye Health Centre and Hartismere Health and Care’ (Site 11), Policy Eye 7 ‘Victoria Mill Allotments’ (Site 4) and Policy Eye 10 ‘Redevelopment of the Chicken Factory’ (Site 9) confirm that archaeological investigations / evaluations will be required before planning permission is granted. Similarly, Policy Eye 6 ‘Land North of Victoria Mill Allotments’ (Site 3) safeguards an area of land within the western section of the site for the preservation of in-situ heritage assets. This will help ensure that provisions are made for the preservation of important below-ground archaeological features.

5.23 Furthermore, planning condition 14 attached to the outline permission of Site 12 ‘Land South of Eye Airfield’ (see Policy Eye 3) states that no development shall take place on site until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which have been submitted and approved in writing by the LPA. The decision notice also states that the scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions designated to safeguard archaeological assets within the approved development boundary from impacts relating to any groundwork associated with the scheme and to ensure the proper and timely investigation, recording, reporting and presentation of archaeological assets affected by the development.

5.24 Overall, the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan take a proactive approach in conserving and enhancing the heritage interests of Eye. It is important to recognise that along with Local Plan policies, the Eye Conservation Area Appraisal also provides a useful reference point for identifying possible issues and opportunities in relation to the historic environment.

**Land, Soil and Water Resources**

5.25 Located within the eastern section of the Neighbourhood Plan area, the River Dove is the main watercourse passing through Eye. Although none of the proposed allocations are located adjacent to the watercourse, Policy Eye 10 ‘Redevelopment of the Chicken Factory’ (Site 9) is located adjacent to a tributary of the River Dove. As such, Policy Eye 10 states that a site investigation will be required to determine groundwater contamination risks before planning permission is granted.

5.26 Concerning the protection of water resources within the Neighbourhood Plan area, Policy Eye 21 ‘Local Green Spaces’ and Policy Eye 22 ‘Biodiversity Networks’ aim to protect open areas, retain habitats and enhance ecological connectivity within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Additionally, Policy Eye 16 ‘Development outside of the Settlement Boundary’ aims to prevent inappropriate developments within the open countryside. This will indirectly and positively contribute to the Water Framework Directive’s objective of achieving ‘good status’ for as many watercourses as possible by 2027 through reducing the potential for surface water run-off by increasing natural infiltrators of precipitation and encouraging the application of permeable areas of hard-standing within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

5.27 In terms of the location of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land, a detailed agricultural land classification assessment has not been undertaken for most of the
Neighbourhood Plan area. Natural England's regional dataset for the East of England confirms that the whole of the parish is underlain by either Grade 2 (good) or Grade 3 (good to moderate) agricultural land. Therefore, allocations on greenfield areas within Eye have the potential to result in the loss of best and most versatile land for agricultural purposes. In this context, four of the six proposed allocations are areas of brownfield land. Development at these locations presents an opportunity to promote the best and most efficient use of previously developed land, whilst also enabling the remediation of potentially contaminated land at these locations. Although two of the six proposed allocations are areas of greenfield land, they are currently not utilised for agricultural purposes and will be enclosed by the proposed allocation through Policy Eye 3 ‘Land South of Eye Airfield’ which has outline permission for 280 dwellings.

5.28 The Environment Agency highlights that groundwater source protection zones (SPZs) such as wells, boreholes and springs provide a significant supply of public drinking water. Particularly, development proposals within SPZs have a higher potential to cause contamination in these areas. Five of the six sites overlap with at least one SPZ, with two of these sites within SPZ Zone I (Inner Protection Zone). As such, Policy Eye 10 (Site 9), Policy Eye 4 ‘Land at Eye Health Centre and Hartismere Health and Care’ (Site 11) confirm that site investigations will be required to determine groundwater contamination risk before planning permission is granted.

Population and Community

5.29 As discussed within Chapter 4 of the Environmental Report, the proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area are not only based on delivering a target number of new dwellings but are also intended to meet specific housing requirements and/or other objectives for the local community. In this context, the Neighbourhood Plan contains six proposed allocations for residential development within Eye, summarised below from Policy Eye 1 ‘Housing Allocations’:

- Policy Eye 3 ‘Land South of Eye Airfield’ (Site 12);
- Policy Eye 4 ‘Land at Eye Health Centre and Hartismere Health and Care’ (Site 11);
- Policy Eye 5 ‘Paddock House, Church Street’ (Site 13);
- Policy Eye 6 ‘Land North of Victoria Mill Allotments’ (Site 3);
- Policy Eye 7 ‘Victoria Mill Allotments’ (Site 4); and
- Policy Eye 10 ‘Redevelopment of the Chicken Factory’ (Site 9);

5.30 An allowance of 60 dwellings on small ‘windfall’ sites is also anticipated during the plan period, stated within Policy Eye 1. The Neighbourhood Plan also contains an aspirational policy for residential development on Site 10 ‘St Peter and St Paul Primary School (see Aspirational Policy Eye 8) but recognises that an appropriate replacement educational facility will be required prior to an allocation coming forward. Policy Eye 14 ‘Land for Primary School, West of Hartismere High School’ is highlighted as a possible reserve site for this purpose. In addition, Policy Eye 13 ‘Crematorium, Land West of Eye Cemetery, Yaxley Road’ (Site 7) is proposed for a crematorium which would expand the existing facility located directly adjacent to the eastern site boundary. Finally, Policy Eye 9 ‘Reserve Site South of Airfield, Phase 2’ (Site 10) safeguards this area of land for a future allocation should further development be required before the end of the plan period.

5.31 It is expected that the proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan will meet and exceed the housing requirements for Eye over the course of the plan period. By delivering a total number of dwellings which is higher than the HNA projection, this is likely to enable the Neighbourhood Plan to provide the appropriate proportion and mix of dwellings in terms of type, tenure and affordability. This is supported through Policy Eye 2 ‘Form of Affordable Housing Provision’. The provision of these policies will therefore support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities, aligning with both national and local policy objectives. However, it is also important to consider whether the proposed allocations will be supported through policies...
which support community vitality of Eye and enhance the economic prosperity of this important ‘Market Town’ within Mid Suffolk.

5.32 For example, Policy Eye 23 ‘Eye District Centre’ and Policy Eye 24 ‘Uses Appropriate to the District Shopping Centre’ indicates that new retail development and/or the creation of additional retail floorspace will be permitted within the defined shopping area, subject to conditions. Specifically, proposals should be designed to a high standard, should not have a significantly adverse impact on the general amenity of neighbouring properties, and should include provisions for traffic management, safety and parking. Likewise, Policy Eye 34 ‘Eye Business Area’ encourages proposals which are likely to generate employment opportunities and expand the service offer within the Neighbourhood Plan area, listing a variety of appropriate uses including: IT centres, data centres, research and development, high value engineering, manufacture, financial, insurance and other business park uses for small uses. These policies will positively enhance the vibrancy and vitality of the town centre area, maintaining its function as a hub for local services and facilities.

5.33 The Neighbourhood Plan also contains several policies which will positively support the quality of life of residents and the satisfaction of residents in the Neighbourhood Plan area as a place to live. For instance, the value of securing improvements to the public realm through the design of new developments is acknowledged through the provisions of Policy Eye 17 ‘Development within the Settlement Boundary’. Similarly, Policy Eye 35 ‘Infrastructure’ identifies the importance of supporting enhancements to community infrastructure through new developments, essential for both a growing and ageing population. Furthermore, Policy Eye 20 ‘Visually Important Open Spaces’ and Policy Eye 21 ‘Local Green Spaces’ aim to safeguard locally valuable community assets and features in the interest of amenity.

5.34 With reference to the proposed allocations, development at two of the six locations has the potential to result in the loss of community infrastructure within the Neighbourhood Plan area. However, Policy Eye 7 ‘Victoria Mill Allotments (Site 4) states that housing is subject to permission by the Secretary of State to dispose the existing allotments and identifying a suitable alternative location. Notably, the SHELAA for the Policy Eye 4 ‘Land at Eye Health Centre and Hartismere Health and Care’ (Site 11) recognises the opportunity to consolidate some of the hospital uses and redevelop areas of the site for housing.

Health and Wellbeing

5.35 A key impact of the policies relating to health and wellbeing within the Neighbourhood Plan will be through protecting and enhancing the area’s natural and built environment. Policy Eye 16 ‘Development outside of the Settlement Boundary’ and Policy Eye 17 ‘Development within the Settlement Boundary’ aim to safeguard these areas from inappropriate development, with proposals required to address various criteria prior to approval in these locations. Amongst other considerations, such criteria relate to design quality and having regard to the surrounding environment and uses. Access to the area’s natural and built environment is equally as important for encouraging active lifestyles. Policy Eye 28 ‘Public Rights of Way West’, Policy Eye 29 ‘Public Rights of Way East’ and Policy Eye 30 ‘Improvement of Public Rights of Way’ affirm that existing PRoW will be retained and enhanced, connecting routes around the Neighbourhood Plan area and facilitating access to the surrounding countryside and villages. This will enable residents to enjoy the natural environment whilst walking, running and cycling, and is supported through Policy Eye 15 ‘Sports Hall and related uses at Hartismere High School’ which aims to provide opportunities which will enable public access to a range of sports facilities within Eye.

5.36 The benefits to emotional wellbeing and mental health resulting from close contact with the natural environment are well-documented, and there is a strong drive to maintain and improve green infrastructure and open spaces through the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy Eye 22 ‘Biodiversity Networks’ states that development proposals should deliver net gains through
enhancing habitats and improving ecological connectivity within the landscape. Likewise, Policy Eye 21 ‘Local Green Spaces’ (LGS) shows a commitment to safeguarding 27 areas of both formal and informal open spaces within the Neighbourhood Plan area which provide recreational benefits to the local community and leisure provision for sport (at some locations). Nonetheless, five of the proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan could potentially result in the loss of some of these spaces, namely:

- Policy Eye 7 (Site 4) – ‘Victoria Mill Allotments LGS’;
- Policy Eye 4 (Site 11) – ‘Hartismere Hospital Roadside Meadow LGS’;
- Policy Eye 3 (Site 12) – ‘The Meadow LGS’; and
- Policy Eye 5 (Site 13) – ‘Paddock House Roadside Meadow LGS’.

However, the provisions of Policy Eye 21 affirm that proposals for development on these areas will only be permitted in very special circumstances, demonstrating how their value can be replaced in another location. Similarly, Policy Eye 35 ‘Infrastructure’ confirms that all development in Eye will be expected to contribute to the infrastructure for the town, including improvement to community facilities and assets.

**Transportation**

Each Local Transport Authority in England and Wales has a statutory duty to produce, adopt and regularly review their Local Transport Plan (LTP) through the Local Transport Act 2000, as amended by the Local Transport Act 2008.Implemented by Suffolk County Council in 2011, the Suffolk LTP aims to support growth with a focus on several objectives which relate to tackling congestion, improving connectivity and accessibility, providing relief to Market Towns from high levels of through traffic and reducing the reliance on private vehicles through promoting alternative methods of travel.

With reference to the Neighbourhood Plan area, there is a need to ensure that developments are in sustainable locations with good access to a range of services and facilities. All six of the proposed allocations are located within or adjacent to the existing built-up area of Eye and are approximately 1km (or nearer) to Eye town centre. Similarly, the sites are all located adjacent to PRoW and are within walking distance to local bus stops. Therefore, residential allocations at these sites are less likely to significantly increase the reliance of privately-owned vehicles for completing day-to-day activities within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Supporting modal shift, Policy Eye 30 ‘Improvement of Public Rights of Way’ states that PRoW will be protected and enhanced, with connecting routes to surrounding countryside and villages also improved. Policy Eye 12 ‘Cycle Parking in Public Car Parks’ affirms that cycle infrastructure should be provided within new car parks to the standards set out in Suffolk’s parking guidance. This is further encouraged through the provisions of Policy Eye 17 ‘Development within the Settlement Boundary’.

Several policies in the Neighbourhood Plan also aim to tackle traffic and congestion issues within Eye. For instance, Policy Eye 33 ‘Traffic Management’ encourages the preparation of a management plan to identify the most appropriate measures for traffic calming, 20 mph areas, one-way streets and lorry routing to ameliorate the growth of traffic within the town centre. Likewise, Policy Eye 11 ‘Public Car Parking at the Rettery’ proposes an area of land adjacent to Eye Fire Station on Lambseth Street for up to 60 public car parking spaces. Located directly to the north of Eye town centre, the car park would positively tackle potential overflow and congestion issues associated with the existing car park off Cross Street in the town centre, whilst also improving access to the Rettery Allotments. Furthermore, Non-Planning Policy Eye 27 ‘Management of Public Car Parking Spaces’ within the Neighbourhood Plan outlines objectives for the management of on and off-street public parking within the town centre area.
Conclusions at this current stage

5.41 The assessment has concluded that the current version of the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to lead to significant positive effects in relation to the ‘Population and Community’ SEA theme. This relates to the focus of the Neighbourhood Plan on the delivery of housing to meet locally arising needs, its impetus on safeguarding and enhancing community infrastructure, and through supporting the economic vitality of one of the key market towns within Mid Suffolk District. The Neighbourhood Plan is also likely to lead to significant positive effects in relation to the ‘Health and Wellbeing’ SEA theme, linked to its promotion of improved walking and cycling networks, enhancements to green infrastructure and open space provision, and the facilitation of high quality and sustainable design through the proposed allocations.

5.42 The Neighbourhood Plan will also bring positive approaches in relation to the ‘Landscape’ and ‘Historic Environment’ SEA themes. These benefits largely relate to the Neighbourhood Plan’s focus on protecting the integrity of the Special Landscape Area and locally important viewpoints, supporting the quality of the public realm, conserving and enhancing historic environment assets and their settings, and safeguarding potential below-ground archaeological features. Additionally, the Neighbourhood Plan will bring positive effects in relation to the ‘Biodiversity’ SEA theme through retaining habitats, enhancing ecological networks and delivering net gains through the proposed allocations. However, given the approaches taken forward through the Neighbourhood Plan will help limit potential effects from new development areas rather than secure significant overall enhancements, these impacts are less likely to comprise significant positive effects overall.

5.43 Regarding the ‘Land, Soil and Water Resources’ SEA theme, the Neighbourhood Plan will lead to positive effects relating to the potential regeneration of previously developed and/or underutilised land through new developments, given four of the six sites taken forward are on brownfield land. However, this is dependent on the extent to which the proposals incorporate high-quality and sensitive design, remediate potential contaminated land and protect both above and below ground water resources. Alongside, two of the six sites will be taken forward on greenfield land.

5.44 The Neighbourhood Plan will also initiate several beneficial approaches regarding the ‘Climate Change’ SEA theme, through encouraging lower carbon modes of transportation and through minimising the flood risks from new development areas. Likewise, the Neighbourhood Plan will also initiate several beneficial approaches for the ‘Transportation’ SEA theme, given its focus on reducing traffic congestion and by ensuring that new developments are in sustainable locations with good access to a range of services and facilities. However, these are not considered to be significant in the context of the SEA process given the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and the scale of proposals.
6. What are the next steps?

6.1 This Environmental Report accompanies the Neighbourhood Plan for submission to the Local Planning Authority, Mid Suffolk District Council, for Independent Examination.

6.2 At Independent Examination, the Neighbourhood Plan will be considered in terms of whether it meets the Basic Conditions for Neighbourhood Plans and is in general conformity with the current adopted Local Plan document for Mid Suffolk.

6.3 If the Independent Examination is favourable, the Eye Neighbourhood Plan will be subject to a referendum, organised by Mid Suffolk District Council. If more than 50% of those who vote agree with the Neighbourhood Plan, then it will be ‘made’. Once made, the Eye Neighbourhood Plan will become part of the Development Plan for Eye Parish.
Appendix A Context Review and Baseline

A1 – Air Quality

Context Review

Key messages from the National Planning Policy Framework\(^{15}\) (NPPF) include:

- ‘Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management, and green infrastructure provision and enhancement. So far as possible these opportunities should be considered at the plan-making stage, to ensure a strategic approach and limit the need for issues to be reconsidered when determining individual applications. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones is consistent with the local air quality action plan.’

- ‘Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health.’

- New and existing developments should be prevented from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution.

Published in January 2018 by the UK Government, ‘A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment\(^{16}\) sets out a number of goals and policies in order to help the natural world regain and retain good health. In this context, Goal 1 ‘Clean Air’ and the policies contained within ‘Chapter 4: Increasing resource efficiency and reducing pollution and waste’ within the 25-year plan directly relate to the air quality SEA theme.

Summary of current baseline

Mid Suffolk District Council is required to monitor air quality across the district under Section 82 of the Environment Act (1995), report regularly to Defra and take action where nationally set levels are likely to be exceeded. Monitoring is undertaken to assess levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO\(_2\)), sulphur dioxide, ozone, benzene and particulates. Where exceedances exist, areas are declared as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and local authorities are required to produce an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) to improve air quality in the area.

As of September 2016, there are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the Neighbourhood Plan area. The latest Annual Status Report (ASR)\(^{17}\) concludes the following: ‘The Babergh and Mid Suffolk districts are predominantly rural, with a number of small market towns. The majority of non-residential areas are used for agricultural activity. Industrial activity in the districts is light in nature with very few large industrial processes. As such, industry has relatively little impact on


\(^{17}\) Babergh District Council & Mid Suffolk District Council (2016): ‘Air Quality Annual Status Report’, [online] available to download via https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/environment/air-quality/ [accessed 20/02/19]
Monitoring in the Mid Suffolk district has not historically shown continuing exceedances of [nitrogen dioxide (\(NO_2\))] ...and there are no designated AQMAs”.

### Summary of future baseline

Whilst no significant air quality issues currently exist within the Eye Neighbourhood Plan area, new housing and employment provision within the parish and the wider area, including through the emerging Joint Local Plan, has the potential for adverse effects on air quality through increasing traffic flows and associated levels of pollutants such as \(NO_2\), particularly along the main routes through the Neighbourhood Plan area. This is particularly important in the local context, as the 2016 ASR states that \(NO_2\) is the main air pollutant of concern within the Mid Suffolk district.

Implementation of the aims, objectives and policies contained in the Local Transport Plan (discussed in Chapter 10) and the emerging Joint Local Plan, present opportunities to continue to improve air quality within both the Neighbourhood Plan area and the wider district.

### A2 – Biodiversity

#### Context Review

At the European level, the EU Biodiversity Strategy\(^\text{18}\) was adopted in May 2011 in order to deliver an established new Europe-wide target to ‘halt the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services in the EU by 2020’.

Key messages from the National Planning Policy Framework\(^\text{19}\) (NPPF) include:

- One of the three overarching objectives of the NPPF is an environmental objective to ‘contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment’ including by ‘helping to improve biodiversity.’

- ‘Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value […] take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries.’

- ‘Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with the statutory status or identified quality in the development plan); and minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.’

- ‘To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:
  
a. Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation; and

b. Promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity’.


The Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP)\textsuperscript{20} sets out the importance of a healthy, functioning natural environment to sustained economic growth, prospering communities and personal well-being. It was in part a response to the UK’s failure to halt and reverse the decline in biodiversity by 2010 and it signalled a move away from the traditional approach of protecting biodiversity in nature reserves to adopting a landscape approach to protecting and enhancing biodiversity. The NEWP also aims to create a green economy in which economic growth and the health of our natural resources sustain each other and markets, business and Government better reflect the value of nature. It includes commitments to:

- Halt biodiversity loss and support functioning ecosystems and establish coherent ecological networks by 2020;
- Establish a new voluntary approach to biodiversity offsetting to be tested in pilot areas;
- Enable partnerships of local authorities, local communities and landowners, the private sector and conservation organisations to establish new Nature Improvement Areas; and
- Address barriers to using green infrastructure to promote sustainable growth.

Reflecting the commitments within the Natural Environment White Paper and the EU Biodiversity Strategy, ‘Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England’s wildlife and ecosystem services’ aims to ‘halt overall biodiversity loss, support healthy well-functioning ecosystems and establish coherent ecological networks, with more and better places for nature for the benefit of wildlife and people’\textsuperscript{21}.

The recently published 25 Year Environment Plan\textsuperscript{22} sets out the Government’s environmental plan of action over the next quarter century, in the context of Brexit. The Plan aims to tackle the growing problems of waste and soil degradation, improving social justice through tackling pollution and promoting the mental and physical health benefits of the natural world. It also sets out how the Government will address the effects of climate change. These aims are supported by a range of policies which are focused on the following six key areas:

- Using and managing land sustainably;
- Recovering nature and enhancing the beauty of landscapes;
- Connecting people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing;
- Increasing resource efficiency, and reducing pollution and waste;
- Securing clean, productive and biologically diverse seas and oceans; and
- Protecting and improving the global environment.

In this context, Goal 3 ‘Thriving plants and wildlife’ and the policies contained within Chapter 2 ‘Recovering nature and enhancing the beauty of landscapes’ and Chapter 5 ‘Securing clean, productive and biologically diverse seas and oceans’ directly relate to the Biodiversity SEA theme.

At the local level, a key objective of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy\textsuperscript{23} is ‘to protect, manage, enhance and restore the landscape, biodiversity and geodiversity of the District’. Policy CS 5 of the Strategy: Mid Suffolk’s Environment also relates to the Biodiversity SEA theme.

Summary of current baseline

European and Nationally designated sites

The Neighbourhood Plan area is not within the boundaries of a European or nationally designated site for biodiversity. However, the 'Major Farm, Braiseworth' Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is located directly adjacent to the western boundary of the Neighbourhood Plan area. Notified in April 1986, the citation for the SSSI states that24:

"Major Farm Meadow is damp and species-rich, one of the few remaining unimproved hay meadows in Suffolk. The meadow is shallow-sloping, on boulder clay of low soil fertility, and characterised by an abundance of mole-hills.

The sward supports a wide variety of grasses and herbs of which Sweet Vernal-grass (*Anthoxanthum odoratum*), Common sorrel (*Rumex acetosa*), Meadow Buttercup (*Ranunculus acris*) and Ribwort (*Plantago lanceolata*) are dominant. Other species include Crested Dogstail (*Cynosurus cristatus*), Red Fescue (*Festuca rubra*), Rough-stalked Meadow Grass (*Poa trivialis*), Perennial Rye grass (*Lolium perenne*), Cock'sfoot (*Dactylis glomerata*) and Yorkshire Fog (*Holcus lanatus*). Herbaceous species include Cuckoo Flower (*Cardamine pratensis*), Pepper Saxifrage (*Silaum silaus*), Oxeye Daisy (*Leucanthemum vulgare*), Adder's Tongue (*Ophioglossum vulgatum*) and the white flowered form of the Bugle (*Ajuga reptans*), with colonies of Cowslip (*Primula veris*), Twayblade (*Listera ovata*), Green-winged Orchid (*Orchis morio*) and Common spotted Orchid (*Dactylorhiza fuchsii*)."

The meadow is bounded by a mature hedgerow containing oak and ash standards and rich in woody species. Within the meadow there is a fine specimen of the rate native Black Poplar (*Populus nigra*)

Based on the most recently completed condition assessment which was undertaken in July 2012, the entire of the SSSI was classified as ‘favourable’.

SSSI Impact Risk Zones (IRZ) are a GIS tool/dataset which maps zones around each SSSI according to the particular sensitivities of the features for which it is notified. They specify the types of development that have the potential to have adverse impacts at a given location, including residential, rural-residential and rural non-residential. Natural England is a statutory consultee on development proposals that might impact on SSSIs. Other than the 50m border of land which surrounds the ‘Major Farm, Braiseworth’ SSSI (which partly overlaps with the Neighbourhood Plan area), the majority of the Neighbourhood Plan area does not overlap with a SSSI Impact Risk Zone for the type of development which is likely to be proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan.

Locally important sites

Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) may be established by Local Authorities in consultation with English Nature under Section 21 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 and are habitats of local importance. Declared in January 1996, ‘The Pennings, Eye’ LNR is located along the River Dove and covers an area of 2.66 ha. Natural England state that most of the site is managed as a ‘hay meadow’ and in the summer months there are abundant flowers and insects to be seen. Views across the water meadows and the church tower make the LNR a relaxing destination for a walk or picnic, with the restored small pond on site providing seating and quiet spots to take in the views. Kingfisher, water vole and otter have been recorded within the LNR25.

BAP Priority Habitats include coastal and floodplain grazing marsh adjacent to the River Dove, areas of deciduous woodland scattered throughout the parish, and an area of good quality semi-improved grassland on land which surrounds Gate Farm (south eastern section of the Neighbourhood Plan area).

---


The figure below shows the designated wildlife sites and BAP priority habitats located within and adjacent to the Neighbourhood Plan area.

**Summary of future baseline**

Habitats and species will potentially face increasing pressures from future development within the Neighbourhood Plan area, with the potential for negative impacts on the wider ecological network. This may include a loss of habitats and impacts on biodiversity networks, which may be exacerbated by the effects of climate change, which has the potential to lead to changes in the distribution and abundance of species and changes to the composition and character of habitats.

The Neighbourhood Plan presents an opportunity to maximise benefits for biodiversity by including consideration of important habitats, species and designated sites at an early stage of planning for future growth. To maintain and improve the condition of biodiversity in the future, it will be important to not only protect and enhance important habitats but the connections between them. It will be crucial to effectively coordinate the delivery of housing, employment and infrastructure to ensure that opportunities to improve green infrastructure and ecological corridors are maximised both within the Neighbourhood Plan area and in the surrounding areas.
A3 – Climate Change

Context Review

The UK Climate Change Act\(^{26}\) was passed in 2008 and established a framework to develop an economically credible emissions reduction path. It also highlighted the role it would take in contributing to collective action to tackle climate change under the Kyoto Protocol, and more recently as part of the UN-led Paris Agreement. The Climate Change Act includes the following:

- The Act commits the UK to reducing emissions by at least 80% in 2050 from 1990 levels.
- The Act requires the Government to set legally binding ‘carbon budgets’ – a cap on the amount of greenhouse gases emitted in the UK over a five-year period. The carbon budgets are designed to reflect the cost-effective path to achieving the UK’s long-term objectives. The first five carbon budgets have been put into legislation and run up to 2032.
- The Committee on Climate Change was set up to advise the Government on emissions targets, and report to Parliament on progress made in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The National Adaptation Programme requires the Government to assess the risks to the UK from climate change, prepare a strategy to address them, and encourage key organisations to do the same.

The UK Climate Change Risk Assessment is published on a 5-yearly cycle in accordance with the requirements of the Climate Change Act 2008. It required the Government to compile an assessment of the risks for the UK arising from climate change, and then develop an adaptation programme to address those risks and deliver resilience to climate change on the ground. For both the 2012 and the 2017 UK Climate Change Risk Assessment, the Adaptation Sub-Committee commissioned an evidence report aiming to understand the current and future climate risks and opportunities. The evidence report\(^{27}\) contains six priority risk areas requiring additional action in the next five years, identified below:

- Flooding and coastal change risks to communities, businesses and infrastructure;
- Risks to health, wellbeing and productivity from high temperatures;
- Risk of shortages in the public water supply, and for agriculture, energy generation and industry;
- Risks to natural capital, including terrestrial, marine and freshwater ecosystems, soils and biodiversity;
- Risks to domestic and international food production and trade; and
- New and emerging pests and diseases, and invasive non-native species, affecting people, plants and animals.

Published in January 2018 by the UK Government, ‘A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment’\(^{28}\) sets out a number of goals and policies in order to help the natural world regain and retain good health. In this context, policies contained within Chapter 1 ‘Using and managing land sustainably’ and Chapter 6 ‘Protecting and improving the global environment’, Goal 4 ‘A reduced risk of harm from environmental hazards such as flooding and drought’ and Goal 7 ‘Mitigating and adapting to climate change’ directly relate to the Climate Change SEA theme.

---


Key messages from the National Planning Policy Framework\(^2\) (NPPF) include:

- One of the three overarching objectives of the NPPF is an environmental objective to ‘contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment’ including by ‘mitigating and adapting to climate change’ and ‘moving to a low carbon economy.’ ‘The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.’

- ‘Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures. Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts, such as providing space for physical protection measures, or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable development and infrastructure.’

- ‘Local planning authorities should support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy, including developments outside areas identified in local plans or other strategic policies that are being taken forward through neighbourhood planning.’

- Direct development away from areas at highest risk of flooding (whether existing or future). ‘Where development is necessary, it should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.’

The Flood and Water Management Act\(^3\) highlights that alternatives to traditional engineering approaches to flood risk management include:

- Incorporating greater resilience measures into the design of new buildings, and retro-fitting properties at risk (including historic buildings);

- Utilising the environment to reduce flooding, for example through the management of land to reduce runoff and through harnessing the ability of wetlands to store water;

- Identifying areas suitable for inundation and water storage to reduce the risk of flooding elsewhere;

- Planning to roll back development in coastal areas to avoid damage from flooding or coastal erosion; and

- Creating sustainable drainage systems.

Further guidance is provided in the document ‘Planning for SuDS’. This report calls for greater recognition of the multiple benefits that water management can present. It suggests that successful SuDS are capable of ‘contributing to local quality of life and green infrastructure’.

At the local level, the following policies within the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy directly relate to the Climate Change SEA theme:

- Policy CS 3: Reduce contributions to Climate Change
- Policy CS 4: Adapting to Climate Change


Summary of current baseline

Contribution to Climate Change

In relation to greenhouse gas emissions, source data from the Department of Energy and Climate Change\(^{31}\) suggests that Mid Suffolk has higher per capita emissions to the East of England and England as a whole since 2005. Mid Suffolk has also seen a 31.9\% reduction in the percentage of total emissions per capita between 2005 and 2016, lower than the reductions for the East of England (33.3\%) and England (37.6\%).

Potential effects of Climate Change

The outcome of research on the probable effects of climate change in the UK was released in 2009 by the UK Climate Projections (UKCP09) team.\(^{32}\) UKCP09 gives climate information for the UK up to the end of this century and projections of future changes to the climate are provided, based on simulations from climate models. Projections are broken down to a regional level across the UK and are shown in probabilistic form, which illustrate the potential range of changes and the level of confidence in each prediction.

As highlighted by the research, the effects of climate change for the South East by 2050 for a medium emissions scenario\(^{33}\) are likely to be as follows:

- The central estimate of increase in winter mean temperature is 2.2°C and an increase in summer mean temperature of 2.8°C; and
- The central estimate of change in winter mean precipitation is 16\% and summer mean precipitation is -19\%.

Resulting from these changes, a range of risks may exist for the Neighbourhood Plan area, including:

- Effects on water resources from climate change;
- Reduction in availability of groundwater for extraction;
- Adverse effect on water quality from low stream levels and turbulent stream flow after heavy rain;
- Increased risk of flooding, including increased vulnerability to 1:100-year floods;
- A need to increase the capacity of wastewater treatment plants and sewers;
- A need to upgrade flood defences;
- Soil erosion due to flash flooding;
- Loss of species that are at the edge of their southerly distribution;
- Spread of species at the northern edge of their distribution;
- Increased demand for air-conditioning;
- Increased drought and flood relating problems such as soil shrinkages and subsidence;
- Risk of road surfaces melting more frequently due to increased temperature; and
- Flooding of roads.

---


\(^{32}\) Data released 18\(^{th}\) June 2009 [online] available at: http://ukclimateprojections.metoffice.gov.uk/21684 [accessed 13/02/19]

Flood Risk

The areas at highest risk of flooding in the Neighbourhood Plan area are those near the River Dove and its tributaries which are in Flood Zone 3. The River Dove is a tributary of the River Waveney. Flood Zone 3 is of a high probability of flooding; representing that there is a 1% (1 in 100) or greater chance of flooding happening each year.

Completed in 2008, the most recent Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)\(^{34}\) for Mid Suffolk highlights that the majority of the settlement of Eye is situated on higher ground in Flood Zone 1; however, there are some isolated properties in the south of the settlement in Flood Zones 2 and 3 which are at risk from flooding. Additionally, the Mid Suffolk Core strategy highlights that Eye is surrounded by Flood Zone 2 but in discussion with the Environment Agency it is agreed that it should not be classified as a ‘dry island’.

The Mid Suffolk SFRA identifies that the town is underlain by a minor aquifer of high and intermediate vulnerability. Due to this, there is a small potential risk of groundwater flooding.

There has been no reporting of sewer flooding incidents in the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Surface water drainage is a risk for some parts of the Neighbourhood Plan area, with sections of medium-high risk predominantly located around the River Dove and its tributaries.

Summary of future baseline

Climate change has the potential to increase the occurrence of extreme weather events in the Neighbourhood Plan area, with increases in mean summer and winter temperatures, increases in mean precipitation in winter and decreases in mean precipitation in summer. This is likely to increase the risks associated with climate change, with an increased need for resilience and adaptation.

A Critical Drainage Area (CDA) is a discrete geographic area where multiple and interlinked sources of flood risk cause flooding in one or more Local Flood Risk Zones (LFRZ) during severe weather, impacting people, property and/or local infrastructure. Mid Suffolk District Council may wish to designate their own CDAs (in the absence of any designations from the Environment Agency)\(^{35}\) within the Neighbourhood Plan area within the future, for reasons such as surface water capacity issues.

In terms of climate change contribution, per capita greenhouse gas emissions generated in the Neighbourhood Plan area may continue to decrease with wider adoption of energy efficiency measures, renewable energy production and new technologies. However, increases in the built footprint of the Neighbourhood Plan area would contribute to increases in the absolute levels of greenhouse gas emissions. There is also a need to increase renewable energy development in Mid Suffolk, which local and neighbourhood planning can contribute to delivering.

A4 - Landscape

Context Review

Key messages from the National Planning Policy Framework \(^{36}\) (NPPF) include:

- ‘Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty […] The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas

---


and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited.’

- Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy making provision for ‘conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure.’
- Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments ‘are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation of change (such as increased densities).’
- ‘Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
  i. protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils
  ii. recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland; and
  iii. remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.’

At the local level, a key objective of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy is to ‘protect, manage, enhance and restore the historic heritage / environment and the unique character and identity of the towns and villages by ensuring that new developments are appropriate in terms of scale and location in the context of settlement form and character’. The following policies in the Strategy also directly relate to the Landscape SEA theme:

- Policy CS 2: Development in the Countryside and Countryside Villages
- Policy CS 5: Mid Suffolk’s Environment

**Summary of current baseline**

**Protected Landscapes**

In the national context, the Neighbourhood Plan area does not overlap with the boundaries of a National Park or an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and does not contain any Green Belt land.

**National Character Areas**

National Character Areas (NCAs) are landscape areas which share similar characteristics, following natural lines in the landscape rather than administrative boundaries. Developed by Natural England, NCA profiles describe the natural and cultural features that shape each of these landscapes, providing a broad context to its character. The Neighbourhood Plan area is located entirely within the ‘South Norfolk and High Suffolk Claylands’ NCA. Published in 2014 by Natural England, the NCA profile describes the area as follows:

“High Suffolk originally derives its name from the contrast between this formerly well-forested area and the openness of the adjacent areas to the east and west. Today it is probably better understood as meaning the high and predominantly flat clay plateau that dominates the character of this NCA. The plateau is incised by numerous small-scale wooded river valleys with complex slopes that in places are much unexpected for East Anglia. The underlying geology is chalk, which forms the principal aquifer,

---

and shallow marine deposits overlain with glacial till, buried river gravels, lake sediments and bands of glacial outwash deposits’.

**Landscape Character**

At the local level, there are two landscape character areas (LCA) which define the Neighbourhood Plan area. These LCAs are defined within the Joint Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council Landscape Guidance\(^{39}\), which was published in 2015. Key characteristics of these LCAs are described below and include (amongst other features):

**Ancient Plateau Claylands LCA 03:**
- The top of the plateaux is generally flat or only gently undulating, with attractive small valleys. Towards the edges it is more dissected with greater more complex slopes;
- Land cover is predominantly arable farmland retaining much of the older field patterns or irregular partitions along with numerous areas of pasture land with substantial blocks of woodland and established hedgerows; and
- Airfields are a recurring feature within this landscape character. In the Neighbourhood Plan area, Eye Airfield has a significant visual impact due to the level topography in this area.

**Rolling Valley Claylands LCA 17:**
- This landscape is found on the sides of the valleys that cut through the central clay plateaux of Suffolk;
- Field sizes are generally small and natural in character, with substantial and long-established hedges of hawthorn, blackthorn and dogwood;
- The Rolling Valley claylands also have some areas of grassland, often in the form of slip meadows along the stream sides;
- With the combination of closeness to water and better-drained and more easily cultivated soils, the river valley slopes have supported settlements from an early date, and some have grown into substantial villages and market towns; and
- New development within this landscape character is likely to have significant impact upon both the character and visual amenity of valley floor and valley side.

Furthermore, land extending to the north and to the south of the town is classified as a Special Landscape Area\(^{40}\).

**Visual Amenity**

Views are an important consideration in the planning process as the scale, height and mass of development can ultimately impact important views if they are not considered and assessed through the process. Changes, such as development and landscape change can see these views degraded over time.

Within more rural communities, ‘key’ or important views normally include the views to and from focal points such as a church, windmill, large manor and estate houses, collection of trees, open spaces and along linear streets and lanes.

In this context, the draft Neighbourhood Plan defines 14 visually important open spaces which overlook locally important areas of landscape value, namely\(^{41}\).

---


- Viewpoint 1: View from Hoxne Road (B1117) looking west towards the town on River Dove Abbey Bridge;
- Viewpoint 2: View from Debenham Road (B1117) looking north towards the town from Big Head;
- Viewpoint 3: View from Magdalen Street (B1117) looking west towards Eye poultry factory on the edge of the town;
- Viewpoint 4: View from Magdalen Street (B1117) looking east towards Eye poultry factory on the edge of the town;
- Viewpoint 5: View from Yaxley Road (B1117) looking west towards the cemetery;
- Viewpoint 6: View from the footpath from Eye poultry factory off the Yaxley Road (B1117) looking east towards Eye fire station and Lambseth Street;
- Viewpoint 7: View from footpath to the east of Eye poultry factory;
- Viewpoint 8: View from the footpath from Eye poultry factory off the Yaxley Road (B1117) looking east towards Eye fire station and Lambseth Street;
- Viewpoint 9: View from Lambseth Street (B1077) looking south west towards Eye fire station;
- Viewpoint 10: View from the shared footpath/cycle way between Wellington Road and Ash Drive looking south towards Hutton Court;
- Viewpoint 11: View from shared footpath/cycle way between Century Road and Ash Drive, looking north east to the proposed residential development site off Tuffs Road;
- Viewpoint 12: View from footpath leading off Century Road towards Abbey Farm, looking south towards the town over the field proposed for residential development site off Tuffs Road;
- Viewpoint 13: View from junction of B1077 with Progress Way leading to the industrial estate on former Eye airfield looking south; and
- Viewpoint 14: View from Castleton Way approaching the town from Yaxley junction of A140 looking north east.

The figure below shows the location of these viewpoints within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

**Summary of future baseline**

New development has the potential to lead to incremental but small changes in landscape and townscape character and quality in and around the Neighbourhood Plan area. This includes from the loss of landscape features and areas with an important visual amenity value.

In the absence of the plan, inappropriate levels of development within the open countryside could negatively impact upon the special qualities and features which contribute to the distinctive character of the LCAs which overlap within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

---

Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Eye Neighbourhood Plan
Environmental Report to accompany the submission version
Prepared for:
Eye Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
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A5 – Historic Environment

Context Review

Key messages from the National Planning Policy Framework\(^{42}\) (NPPF) include:

- Heritage assets should be recognised as an ‘irreplaceable resource’ that should be conserved in a ‘manner appropriate to their significance’, taking account of ‘the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits’ of conservation, whilst also recognising the positive contribution new development can make to local character and distinctiveness.
- Plans should set out a ‘positive strategy’ for the ‘conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment’, including those heritage assets that are most at risk.
- ‘When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss of less than substantial harm to its significance.’

The policies contained within Chapter 2 ‘Recovering nature and enhancing the beauty of landscapes’ and Goal 6 ‘Enhanced beauty, heritage and engagement with the natural environment’ of the Government’s ‘A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment’ directly relates to the Landscape and Historic Environment SEA theme.

The Government’s Statement on the Historic Environment for England\(^{43}\) sets out its vision for the historic environment. It calls for those who have the power to shape the historic environment to recognise its value and to manage it in an intelligent manner in light of the contribution that it can make to social, economic and cultural life.

Historic England is the statutory body that helps people care for, enjoy and celebrate England’s spectacular historic environment. Guidance and advice notes provide essential information for local planning authorities, neighbourhood groups, developers, consultants, landowners and other interested parties on historic environment considerations, and are regularly reviewed and updated in light of legislative changes. The following guidance and advice notes are particularly relevant, and should be read in conjunction with the others.

Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management: Historic England Advice Note 1 (February 2016)\(^{44}\) outlines ways to manage change that conserves and enhances historic areas in order to positively contribute to sustainable development. Principally, the advice note emphasises the importance of:

- Understanding the different types of special architectural and historic interest which underpin the designations; and
- Recognising the value of implementing controls through the appraisal and/or management plan which positively contribute to the significance and value of conservation areas.

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA): Historic England Advice Note 8 (December 2016)\(^{45}\) provides support to all stakeholders involved in assessing the effects of
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certain plans and programmes on the historic environment. It offers advice on heritage considerations during each stage of the SA/SEA process and helps to establish the basis for robust and comprehensive assessments.

Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd Edition) (December 2017)\footnote{Historic England (2017): 'Setting of Heritage Assets: 2\textsuperscript{nd} Edition', [online] available to download via: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/> last accessed [11/12/18]} provides general advice on understanding setting, and how it may contribute to the significance of heritage assets and allow that significance to be appreciated, as well as advice on how views can contribute to setting. Specifically, Part 2 of the advice note outlines a five stepped approach to conducting a broad assessment of setting:

- **Step 1:** Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected;
- **Step 2:** Assess the degree to which these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated;
- **Step 3:** Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance or on the ability to appreciate it;
- **Step 4:** Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm; and
- **Step 5:** Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

Neighbourhood Planning and the Historic Environment: Historic England Advice Note 11 (October 2018)\footnote{Historic England (2018): 'Neighbourhood Planning and the Historic Environment', [online] available to download via: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/neighbourhood-planning-and-the-historic-environment/> last accessed [11/12/18]} outlines the importance of considering the historic environment whilst preparing the plan (section 1), which culminates in a checklist of relevant of issues to consider, followed by an overview of what this means in terms of evidence gathering (section 2). Sections 3 to 5 of the advice note focus on how to translate evidence into policy, understand the SEA process and Historic England’s role in neighbourhood planning.

At the local level, Policy CS 5 ‘Mid Suffolk’s Environment’ within the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008) directly relates to the historic environment SEA theme.

**Summary of current baseline**

**Historic Evolution of Eye**

As stated within the 'Historic Environment'\footnote{Eye Town Council (ca 2018): 'Supporting Document 13 – Historic Environment', [online] available to access via: http://www.eyesuffolk.org/town-council/neighbourhood-plan/ [last accessed 20/02/19]} supporting document which has been prepared as part of the evidence base for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, the town of Eye derives its name from the Saxon word for ‘island’. Archaeological finds within and surrounding the town includes an Acheulean hand axe, a Paleolithic small hand axe, Mesolithic worked flints, Neolithic flint blades and cremations, and a Bronze Age hoard and cremations. In 1781, labourers unearthed a lead box by the river at Clint Farm, just South of Eye, which contained about 600 Roman gold coins – one of the largest hoard of Roman gold coins ever discovered in Britain.

Before the Norman Conquest, Eye was one of the numerous holdings of Edric of Laxfield, a wealthy and influential Saxon and the third largest land holder in Suffolk. After the Norman Conquest, the importance of the town was firmly established in the region when the Honour of Eye was granted to William Malet, a Norman Lord. Between 1066 and 1071 Malet constructed a castle occupying the higher ground of Eye, which was almost certainly achieved by flattening the centre of the Old Saxon town to make way for a large open area of land on which Malet could build the castle. The shape of Eye Castle is still visible today, with the lines of the castle being marked by Church Street to the North and East, Castle Street to the South, and Broad Street. Subsequently, Malet established his military and
administrative headquarters and started a highly successful Saturday market in about 1070. This would initiate the urbanisation of Eye.

Eye Castle began to lose its strategic importance after 1173 when it was attacked by Hugh Bigod, 1st Earl of Norfolk; during the rebellion against Henry II, and later during the Second Barons’ War of 1265. After this, Eye Castle never regained its former status.

Through the centuries, Eye has remained a relatively small settlement which has prospered as a market town with an annual Whit Monday Fair. Local industry in the town has included two breweries, several slaughter houses, an iron and brass Founders, and a Gas works. There was also a flax works and two retteries for the process of flax. While trade included blacksmiths, wheelwrights, cooperers, clock makers, milliners, tailors, printers, butchers, grocers and banks.

**Historic Character and Sensitivity of Eye**

Completed in March 2018 to inform the evidence base of the emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan, the Heritage and Settlement Sensitivity Assessment[^49] for Mid Suffolk describes the historic settlement of Eye as follows: “Eye is a small town sited on higher ground to the west of the River Dove. The historic core of the town is laid out in an irregular oval shape, which follows the line of the original outer bailey around the castle, which is sited in the centre of the settlement. The historic settlement contains a large number of listed buildings, a number of which are Grade I or Grade II* listed. To the north of the settlement there is an outlying group of listed buildings located around Langton Green. The church is sited at the eastern edge of the settlement, close to the River Dove. Across the river, outside the town to the east, are the remains of Eye Priory. There has been modern infill to the settlement, with the majority located to the north and subsuming the historic group of buildings at Langton Green”.

In regards to the settlement’s susceptibility to change, the Sensitivity Assessment goes on to state that “the area to the east of the settlement particularly that between the Priory and the church, is highly sensitive to change, as is the relatively undeveloped southern edge of the settlement. To the north and north west there is a considerable amount of modern development which has eroded the understanding of the historic settlement edge. In particular, this modern development has completely eroded the historic separation between Eye and the hamlet at Langton Green to the north. The significance of the listed buildings around Langton Green has been further harmed by piecemeal modern development with circles them. The northern edge of the settlement is therefore considered to be of lower susceptibility to change.

**Designated Heritage Assets**

Historic England is the statutory consultee for certain categories of listed building consent and all applications for scheduled monument consent. The historic environment is protected through the planning system, via conditions imposed on developers and other mechanisms. The Neighbourhood Plan area contains three Grade I, seven Grade II* and 154 Grade II nationally designated listed buildings which are protected through the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990. The Grade I and II* listed buildings are as follows:

- Eye Castle (Grade I);
- Church of St Peter and St Paul (Grade I);
- The Guildhall (Grade I);
- 5, Broad Street (Grade II*);
- Town Hall (Grade II*);

• Stayer House (Grade II*);
• Cookley Farmhouse (Grade II*);
• Cranley Hall (Grade II*);
• Barn at Moor Hall Farm (Moor Hall Farm not included) (Grade II*); and
• The Cottage White House (Grade II*).

Scheduled monuments are sites of national importance and protected by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. According to the National Heritage List for England50, there are eight scheduled monuments within the Neighbourhood Plan area, namely:

• Barn at Rook Hall;
• Remains of Eye Priory at Abbey Farm;
• Moated site 170m south east of Cranley Hall;
• Remains of motte and bailey castle 120m west of St Peter’s Church;
• Moated site at Cranley Hall;
• Moated site at Gate Farm;
• Moated site at King’s Farm; and
• Moated site at Filmworth Hall.

Conservation areas are designated because of their special architectural and historic interest. Conservation Area Appraisals are a tool to demonstrate the area’s special interest, explaining the reasons for designation and providing a greater understanding and articulation of its character - mentioned within the ‘Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management’ advice note by Historic England51. Ideally, appraisals should be regularly reviewed as part of the management of the conservation area and can be developed into a management plan.

Originally designated by East Suffolk County Council in 1970, and inherited by Mid Suffolk District Council in 1974, the Eye Conservation Area covers the majority of the built-up area of the town. Completed in 2011, the Eye Conservation Area Appraisal52 provides a description of the archaeological significance, the intrinsic quality of buildings and the traditional materials which are prevalent within the town. Similarly, detail regarding the layout of open spaces, trees and planting and the town’s relationship with the open countryside, is also provided. Therefore, the Conservation Area Appraisal provides a useful reference point for identifying possible issues and opportunities for consideration.

Since 2008, Historic England has released an annual Heritage at Risk Register. The Heritage at Risk Register highlights the Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings, scheduled monuments, historic parks and gardens, registered battlefields, wreck sites and conservation areas deemed to be ‘at risk’. According to the 2018 Heritage at Risk Register for East England53 there is one heritage assets in the Neighbourhood Plan area considered to be ‘at risk’, namely:

• Barn at Rook Hall (Scheduled Monument) is classified as being in a very bad condition within priority category C (slow decay, no solution agreed). A Historic England heritage at risk repair grant was awarded towards the cost of temporary works which were needed to stabilise the...
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52 Mid Suffolk District Council (2011): ‘Eye Conservation Area Appraisal’, [online] available to download via: [https://www.babergh.gov.uk/planning/heritage/conservation-area-appraisals/] [last accessed 20/02/19]
structure, with these works implemented in June 2018. Discussions are on-going to consider and agree the next steps to secure a scheme of full repair of the barn.

However, it is important to recognise that the Heritage at Risk Registers for areas outside of London do not contain information about the status of Grade II listed buildings. As such, it is currently not possible to determine whether the two Grade II listed buildings within the Neighbourhood Plan are at risk.

The figure above shows the location of the scheduled monuments, listed buildings and conservation area within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Locally Important Heritage Features

It should be noted that not all of the area’s historic environment features are subject to statutory designations, and non-designated features comprise a large part of what people have contact with as part of daily life – whether at home, work or leisure. Although not designated, many buildings and areas are of historic interest and are seen as important by local communities. For example, open spaces and key distinctive buildings in the area are likely to be of value for local people.

Following a high-level review of the Historic Environmental Record for Suffolk (accessed via the Heritage Gateway54), there are 154 listings within Eye parish, including Anglo-Saxon artefacts and archaeological finds dating to the Bronze Age, Neolithic period, Mesolithic period and Roman period.

Summary of future baseline

New development areas in the Neighbourhood Plan area have the potential to impact on the fabric and setting of heritage assets; for example, through inappropriate design and layout. It should be noted, however, that existing historic environment designations offer a degree of protection to heritage assets and their settings.

Alongside, new development need not be harmful to the significance of a heritage asset, and in the context of the Neighbourhood Plan area there may be opportunity for new development to enhance the historic setting of the town and better reveal assets’ heritage significance.

A6 – Land, Soil and Water Resources

Context Review

The EU’s Soil Thematic Strategy55 presents a strategy for protecting soil resources in Europe. The main aim of the strategy is to minimise soil degradation and limit associated detrimental effects linked to water quality and quantity, human health, climate change, biodiversity, and food safety.

The EU Water Framework Directive 56(WFD) drives a catchment-based approach to water management. In England and Wales there are 100 water catchments and it is Defra’s intention is to establish a ‘framework for integrated catchment management’ across England. The Environment Agency is establishing ‘Significant Water Management Issues’ and recently presented second River Basin Management Plans to ministers. The plans seek to deliver the objectives of the WFD namely:

- Enhance the status and prevent the further deterioration of aquatic ecosystems and associated wetlands which depend on aquatic ecosystems;
- Promote the sustainable use of water;
- Reduce the pollution of water, especially by ‘priority’ and ‘priority hazardous’ substances; and
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Ensure the progressive reduction of groundwater pollution.

Key messages from the National Planning Policy Framework\(^\text{57}\) (NPPF) include:

- ‘Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
  
  a. Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils
  
  b. recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland’; and
  
  c. Prevent new or existing development from being ‘adversely affected’ by the presence of ‘unacceptable levels’ of soil pollution or land instability and be willing to remediate and mitigate ‘despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate’.

- ‘Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or ‘brownfield’ land.’

- ‘Encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains.’

- Planning policies and decisions should ‘give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs’, and ‘promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings.’

- Taking a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for water supply.

- Prevent new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution.

- The government has produced a separate plan that specifically deals with planning policy in relation to water management; this should be read in conjunction with the NPPF.

- Encourage the effective use of land’ through the reuse of land which has been previously developed, ‘provided that this is not of high environmental value’. Whilst there is no longer a national requirement to build at a minimum density, the NPPF requires local planning authorities to ‘set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances’.

- Produce strategic policies to deliver the provision of a variety of infrastructure, including that necessary for water supply.

- With regards to waste, the NPPF does not contain any specific waste policies as waste planning policy will be published as part of the National Waste Management Plan.

Along with the policies contained within Chapter 1 ‘Using and managing land sustainably’ and Chapter 4 ‘Increasing resource efficiency, and reducing pollution and waste’, Goal 2 ‘Clean and plentiful water’, Goal 5 ‘Using resources from nature more sustainably and efficiently’ and Goal 8 ‘Minimising waste’ of the Government’s ‘A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment’\(^\text{58}\) directly relates to the land, soil and water resources SEA theme.
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Other key documents at the national level include Safeguarding our Soils: A Strategy for England\(^6\), which sets out a vision for soil use in England, and the Water White Paper\(^6\), which sets out the Government’s vision for a more resilient water sector. It states the measures that will be taken to tackle issues such as poorly performing ecosystems, and the combined impacts of climate change and population growth on stressed water resources.

In terms of waste management, the Government Review of Waste Policy in England\(^61\) recognises that environmental benefits and economic growth can be the result of a more sustainable approach to the use of materials.

The National Waste Management Plan\(^62\) provides an analysis of the current waste management situation in England, and evaluates how it will support the implementation of the objectives and provisions of the revised Waste Framework Directive\(^63\). This includes an assessment of the need for new collection schemes, additional waste infrastructure and investment channels, as well as providing general or strategic waste management policies.

At the local level, a key objective of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy is to ‘seek to improve water quality and reduce pollution to the wider environment’. Policy CS 4: Adapting to Climate Change in the Strategy also directly relates to the Land, Soil and Water Resources SEA theme.

**Summary of current baseline**

*Soil resources*

The Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) classifies land into size grades (plus ‘non-agricultural land’ and ‘urban’), where Grades 1 to 3a are recognised as being the ‘best and most versatile’ land and Grades 3b to 5 of poorer quality. In this context, there is a need to avoid loss of higher quality ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land.

At the local level a detailed classification has not been undertaken for the Neighbourhood Plan area. As such, there is a need to rely on the national ‘Provisional Agricultural Land Quality’ dataset.

The Provisional Agricultural Land Quality dataset\(^64\) shows that the Neighbourhood Plan area is predominantly covered by Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land, however, without the subset grading (3a or 3b) it is not possible to tell at this stage whether all of the agricultural land is considered to be ‘best and most versatile’. It is also important to note that the national dataset is of very low resolution, and may not necessarily provide an accurate reflection of the agricultural land quality within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

*Water resources*

The main watercourse flowing through the Neighbourhood Plan area is the River Dove which flows from the south to the north of the Neighbourhood Plan area and eventually joins the River Waveney.

Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZs) have been defined by the Environment Agency in England and Wales to protect groundwater sources such as wells, boreholes and springs that are used
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\(^63\) Directive 2008/98/EC

for public drinking water supply. Within the Neighbourhood Plan area, there are two SPZs (Zone I – Inner Protection Zone), one covering the built-up settlement of Eye and one in the south of the Neighbourhood Plan area. Areas of Zone II – Outer Protection Zone and Zone III – Total Catchment also lie within the Neighbourhood Plan area surrounding Zone I. These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area.

**Water quality**

The Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the Waveney operational catchment. The operational catchment contains 10 waterbodies. The water bodies identified as ‘Dove trib – Eye’ and ‘Dove’ is relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan area. The ‘Dove trib – Eye’ is classified by the Environment Agency as having ‘good’ chemical quality, and ‘moderate’ ecological quality. This could be linked to nitrates; given that the whole Neighbourhood Plan area lies within a designated Surface Water Nitrate Vulnerable Zone. The water body ‘Dove’ also has the same chemical and ecological status as ‘Dove trib – Eye’. Reasons for not achieving good ecological status are due to sewage discharge, livestock, poor nutrient management and land drainage.

**Summary of future baseline**

Further development has the potential to affect water quality through diffuse pollution, waste water discharges, water run-off, and modification. However, water companies are likely to maintain adequate water supply over the plan period, and the requirements of the Water Framework Directive are likely to lead to continued improvements to water quality within the Neighbourhood Plan area and wider area.

It is unlikely that small scale development proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan area would have a significant impact on the wider area’s Nitrate Vulnerable Zone unless agricultural intensification occurs.

Given the presence of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land in the Neighbourhood Plan area, development has the potential to lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

**A7 – Population and Community**

**Context Review**

Key messages from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) include:

- ‘One of the three overarching objectives of the NPPF is a social objective to; ‘support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural wellbeing.’

- To support the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing, strategic policies ‘should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.’

- The size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. Where a need for affordable housing is identified,
planning policies should specify the type of affordable housing required, and expect it to be met on-site where possible.

- Recognise the important contribution of small and medium sized development sites in meeting housing needs. Local Plans should identify land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare, and neighbourhood planning groups should also consider the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites.

- In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate. Authorities should consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs.

- Promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.

- Ensure that developments create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion. Places should contain clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high-quality public spaces, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas.

- Ensuring that there is a ‘sufficient choice of school places’ and taking a ‘proactive, positive and collaborative approach’ to bringing forward ‘development that will widen choice in education’.

The ‘Ready for Ageing?’ report, published by the Select Committee on Public Service and Demographic Change warns that society is underprepared for an ageing population. The report states that ‘longer lives can be a great benefit, but there has been a collective failure to address the implications and without urgent action this great boon could turn into a series of miserable crises. The report recognises that the supply of specialist housing for the older generation is insufficient for the demand. There is a need for central and local Government, housing associations, and house builders to ensure that these housing needs are better addressed, giving as much priority to promoting an adequate market of social housing for the older generation as is given to the younger generation.


At the local level, key objectives of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy are to ‘support sustainable communities by locating development where it will enable people to access jobs and key services, such as education, health, recreation and other facilities recognising and respecting the diversity in the function and character of Mid Suffolk’s towns, key service centres and primary and secondary villages and countryside’ and to ‘prepare for an ageing population, including the provision and retention of community facilities and suitable housing, including sheltered and assisted accommodation’. Policy CS 2: Development in the Countryside and Countryside Villages and Policy CS 9: Density and Mix from the Strategy also directly relates to the Population and Community SEA theme.

**Summary of current baseline**

**Population**

---

Select Committee on Public Service and Demographic Change (2013) Ready for Ageing? [online] available at: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201213/ldselect/ldpublic/140/140.pdf [accessed 19/02/19]

The population of Eye increased at a higher rate (25.9%) than Mid Suffolk (11.4%), the South East of England (7.9%) and England (7.9%) averages between 2001 and 2011.

**Age Structure**

There are a higher proportion of residents within the 60+ age category within the Neighbourhood Plan area (34.4%) in comparison to the percentages for Mid Suffolk (27.9%), the South East (23.3%) and England (22.3%).

In contrast, a lower proportion of residents are within the working age categories (25-44 and 45-59) in the Neighbourhood Plan area (38.5%) in comparison to the totals for Mid Suffolk (44.5%), the South East of England (46.4%) and England (46.9%).

Additionally, 27.1% of residents within the Neighbourhood Plan area are within the younger age categories (0-15 and 16-24), broadly similar to the totals for Mid Suffolk (27.6%), but slightly less than the totals for the South East of England (30.2%) and England (30.8%).

**Household deprivation**

Census statistics measure deprivation across four ‘dimensions’ of deprivation, summarized below:

- **Employment**: Any person in the household (not a full-time student) that is either unemployed or long-term sick.
- **Education**: No person in the household has at least a level 2 qualification and no person aged 16-18 is a full-time student.
- **Health and Disability**: Any person in the household that has generally ‘bad’ or ‘very bad’ health or has a long-term health problem.
- **Housing**: The household accommodation is either overcrowded (with an occupancy rating of -1 or less), in a shared dwelling or has no central heating.

More households are deprived in one or more dimensions within the Neighbourhood Plan area (56.9%) in comparison to Mid Suffolk (51.3%) the South East of England (52.3%) however this is similar to England (57.5%). Out of the 56.9% of households which are deprived in the Neighbourhood Plan area, the majority are deprived in one or two dimensions, which is similar to the regional and national averages.

**Index of Multiple Deprivation**

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (IMD) is an overall relative measure of deprivation constructed by combining seven domains of deprivation according to their respective weights, as described below. The seven deprivation domains are as follows:

- **Income**: The proportion of the population experiencing deprivation relating to low income, including those individuals that are out-of-work and those that are in work but who have low earnings (satisfying the respective means tests).
- **Employment**: The proportion of the working-age population in an area involuntarily excluded from the labour market, including those individuals who would like to work but are unable to do so due to unemployment, sickness or disability, or caring responsibilities.
- **Education, Skills and Training**: The lack of attainment and skills in the local population.
- **Health Deprivation and Disability**: The risk of premature death and the impairment of quality of life through poor physical or mental health. Morbidity, disability and premature mortality are also considered, excluding the aspects of behaviour or environment that may be predictive of future health deprivation.
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71 ONS (no date): Census 2011: Population Density 2011 (Table QS102EW); Population Density 2001 (Table UV02)
72 ONS (no date): Census 2011: Age Structure 2011 (Table KS102EW)
73 ONS (no date): Census 2011: ‘Households by Deprivation Dimensions 2011 (Table QS119EW)
• Crime: The risk of personal and material victimisation at local level.

• Barriers to Housing and Services: The physical and financial accessibility of housing and local services, with indicators categorised in two sub-domains.
  a. ‘Geographical Barriers’: relating to the physical proximity of local services
  b. ‘Wider Barriers’: relating to access to housing, such as affordability.

• Living Environment: The quality of the local environment, with indicators falling categorised in two sub-domains.
  c. ‘Indoors Living Environment’ measures the quality of housing.
  d. ‘Outdoors Living Environment’ measures air quality and road traffic accidents.

• Two supplementary indices (subsets of the Income deprivation domains), are also included:
  1. Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index: The proportion of all children aged 0 to 15 living in income deprived families.
  2. Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index: The proportion of all those aged 60 or over who experience income deprivation.

Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) are a geographic hierarchy designed to improve the reporting of small area statistics in England and Wales. They are standardized geographies designed to be as consistent in population as possible, with each LSOA containing approximately 1,000 to 1,500 people. In relation to the IMD 2015, LSOAs are ranked out of the 32,844 in England and Wales, with 1 being the most deprived. Ranks are normalized into deciles, with a value of 1 reflecting the top 10% most deprived LSOAs in England and Wales.

The Neighbourhood Plan area falls within the LSOA Mid Suffolk 001A. This LSOA is within the 50% least deprived LSOAs in England.

Housing tenure

Within the Neighbourhood Plan area, 67.5% of residents either own their home outright or with a mortgage, lower than the percentages for Mid Suffolk (75.0%), the South East of England (67.6%) and England (63.3%). There is a lower proportion of residents living within privately rented in the Neighbourhood Plan area in comparison to the regional and national trends. Additionally, there are a greater proportion of residents living in social rented accommodation in comparison to Mid Suffolk, the South East of England and England. The percentage of residents in the Neighbourhood Plan area living in shared ownership accommodation (0.9%) is similar to the totals for Mid Suffolk (0.9%), the South East of England (1.1%) and England (0.8%).

The 2009 Parish Plan found through comprehensive surveys that 77% of people who live in Eye live in owner-occupied properties and 23% live in rented accommodation, of which 11% is council rented, 8% privately rented, and 3% housing association stock. Furthermore, 1% live in shared ownership or tied accommodation.

The 2018 Local Housing Needs Survey identified the following from 250 questionnaires (representing 26% of households in Eye):

• 79% of houses have at least three bedrooms;
• 64% of homes are owned outright with a further 23% being owned with a mortgage; and
• 76% of households have no more than two people living in them.

74 ONS (no date): Census 2011: Tenure-Households 2011 (Table QS405EW)
The Eye Town Housing Needs Assessment identifies a housing needs figure of 164 dwellings by 2036. It also highlights that people under 35 have difficulty forming their own households and there is a lack of affordable housing in Eye suitable for younger people.

This assessment has also estimated an increase of 258 residents aged 75+ between 2011 and 2036. Additionally, some household members were identified as wishing to move into retirement/sheltered housing in the next five to ten years. Therefore, there is a need for additional specialist housing for older people in the Neighbourhood Plan area.

**Education and Employment**

Based on the 2011 census data, 14.8% of residents in the Neighbourhood Plan area have no qualifications, slightly lower than the total for Mid Suffolk (15.2%), the South East of England (19.1%) and England (20.7%). Comparatively, 39.8% of residents within the Neighbourhood Plan area have a Level 4 qualification or above, which is over 10% higher than the total for the South East of England (29.9%) and the total for England (27.4%).

In regard to employment within the Neighbourhood Plan area, the following three occupation categories support the most residents:

- Professional occupations (18.0%);
- Skilled trades occupations (17.2%); and
- Managers, directors, senior officials (11.1%).

Overall, 46.3% of residents within the Neighbourhood Plan area are employed in one of the above three occupation categories, greater than the totals for Mid Suffolk (42.2%), the South East of England (42.1%) and England (39.7%). This suggests that the Neighbourhood Plan area has a highly skilled workforce, supported by the percentage of residents with a Level 4 qualification or above.

The 2009 Parish Plan found that through comprehensive surveys on 1,140 people, 29% were employed full time, 14% part time, and a further 12% were self-employed. 4% said that they worked from home. Over one third (37%) were retired.

**Summary of future baseline**

As the population continues to age, this has the potential to place pressures on the existing services and facilities within the timeframe of the Neighbourhood Plan. This could negatively impact on the future vitality of the local community and economy.

Population trends indicate an ageing population. This can have implications for housing and may indicate a need for more specialist accommodation to meet the needs of the elderly in the future, and also the provision of services and facilities.

Overall levels of deprivation in the Neighbourhood Plan area are likely to remain low.

**A8 – Health and Wellbeing**

**Context Review**

Key messages from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) include:
One of the three overarching objectives of the NPPF is a social objective to; ‘support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural wellbeing.’

‘Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.’

Policies and decisions should take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community.

Access to a network of high-quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and wellbeing of communities. Development should avoid building on existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields.

Promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.

The policies contained in Chapter 3 ‘Connecting people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing’ of the Government’s ‘A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment’ directly relates to the health and wellbeing SEA theme.

Other key national messages in relation to health include; Fair Society, Healthy Lives (The Marmot Review) which investigated health inequalities in England and the actions needed in order to tackle them. Subsequently, a supplementary report was prepared providing additional evidence relating to spatial planning and health on the basis that there is ‘overwhelming evidence that health and environmental inequalities are inexorably linked and that poor environments contribute significantly to poor health and health inequalities’.

The increasing role that local level authorities are expected to play in providing health outcomes is demonstrated by recent government legislation. The Health and Social Care Act 2012 transferred responsibility for public health from the NHS to local government, giving local authorities a duty to improve the health of the people who live in their areas. This will require a more holistic approach to health across all local government functions.

At the local level, a key objective of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy is to ‘provide appropriate healthcare for an ageing population; secure independence at home; promote healthy living; deal with the causes and effects of social exclusion; and decrease the number of accidents in the community.’

**Summary of current baseline**

*Health indicators and deprivation*

Deprivation is a significant contributor to poor health and can have adverse effects on wellbeing, with elements related to poor housing quality, living environment, income and employment previously discussed in detail in the Population and Community section above.

---


Based on 2011 Census statistics\(^85\), 80.3% of residents in the Neighbourhood Plan area consider themselves as having ‘very good health’ or ‘good health’, slightly lower than the totals for Mid Suffolk (83.2%), the South East of England (83.7%) and England (81.4%). Similarly, the percentage of residents in the Neighbourhood Plan area considering themselves to have ‘bad health’ or ‘very bad health’ is 5.3%, greater than the totals for Mid Suffolk (4.0%) and the South East of England (4.3%), but similar to the total for England (5.4%).

The total percentage of residents within the Neighbourhood Plan area who report that their activities are limited ‘a little’ is higher the regional and national totals\(^86\). There is a higher proportion of residents within the Neighbourhood Plan area who report that their activities are limited ‘a lot’ (8.5%) in comparison to Mid Suffolk (6.7%), the South East of England (7.4%) and England (8.3%). Overall, 79.8% of residents in the Neighbourhood Plan area report that their activities are ‘not limited’, slightly less than the totals for Mid Suffolk (83.5%), the South East of England (83.3%) and England (82.4%).

**Summary of future baseline**

Health and wellbeing levels within the Neighbourhood Plan area are generally less favourable than regional and national averages with a lower percentage of residents reporting ‘good’ or ‘very good’ health.

A growing and ageing population within the Neighbourhood Plan area may increase the reported cases of disability, reduce the levels of good health, and place future pressures on health services in the wider area. Similarly, ongoing cuts to community services have the potential to lead to effects on health and wellbeing.

Obesity is also seen as an increasing issue by health professionals, and one that will contribute to significant health impacts on individuals, including increasing the risk of a range of diseases, including heart disease, diabetes and some forms of cancer.

**A9 – Transportation**

**Context Review**

European and UK transport policies and plans place emphasis on the modernisation and sustainability of the transport network. Specific objectives include reducing pollution and road congestion through improvements to public transport, walking and cycling networks and reducing the need to travel. National policy also focuses on the need for the transport network to support sustainable economic growth.

Key messages from the National Planning Policy Framework\(^87\) (NPPF) include:

- ‘Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:
  a. The potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed
  b. Opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised
  c. Opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued
  d. The environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account

\(^{85}\) ONS (no date): Census 2011: ‘General Health 2011’ (Table QS302EW)
\(^{86}\) ONS (no date): Census 2011: ‘Long-term Health Problem or Disability 2011’ (Table QS303EW)
Patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes and contribute to making high quality places.’

- ‘Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.’

At the local level, each Local Transport Authority in England and Wales has a statutory duty to produce and adopt a Local Transport Plan (LTP) through the Local Transport Act 2000, as amended by the Local Transport Act 2008. Implemented by Suffolk County Council, the ‘Suffolk LTP 2011-2031’ aims to support business and growth with a focus on:

- The challenge of maintaining the highway network in good condition;
- Tackling congestion in the larger towns by more efficient management of traffic, reducing the demand for car travel and promoting more sustainable means of travel;
- Improved connectivity and accessibility in rural areas;
- Seeking improvement to the A11, A12 and A14 trunk roads connecting businesses in Suffolk to each other and to their markets;
- Seeking improvement to the rail network for freight and passengers;
- Relief for our market towns suffering from high levels of through traffic; and
- Recognising that securing high speed broadband throughout Suffolk is very important at present in addressing accessibility and connectivity issues throughout Suffolk and supporting business growth.

At the local level, a key objective of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy is to ‘support and enable public and community transport services and encourage walking and cycling initiatives to provide access to jobs, shops and services and consider new methods of delivering and protecting existing services for smaller communities’. Policy CS 6: Services and Infrastructure also directly relates to the Transportation SEA theme.
Summary of current baseline

Rail network

There are no railway stations within the Neighbourhood Plan area. The nearest stations to the Neighbourhood Plan area are Diss (approximately 4km from the northern boundary) and Stowmarket (approximately 14.7km from the southern boundary). Diss and Stowmarket railway stations are on the Great Eastern Main Line and provides services to Norwich, Ipswich, Essex and London Liverpool Street.

Bus network

In regard to the bus network, there are twelve local bus services in operation from the Neighbourhood Plan area providing regular services, as outlined below:

- Route 4: Bedfield - Worlingworth - Redlingfield – Diss;
- Route 40: Diss - Eye - Fressingfield – Norwich;
- Route 112: Eye – Diss;
- Route 113: Ipswich - Mendlesham – Eye;
- Route 114: Ipswich - Debenham – Eye;
- Route 319: Syleham - Stradbroke - Hoxne - Denham – Eye;
- Route 320: Bury St Edmunds - Norton - Bacton – Eye;
- Route 456: Eye - Bacton/Mendlesham – Stowmarket;
- Route 475: Eye - Brome – Diss;
- Route 482: Diss - Eye - Stradbroke – Framlingham;
- Route EE310: Palgrave - Rickinghall - Yaxley – Eye; and

Road network

The Neighbourhood Plan area is well connected to the national road network. Victoria Lane and Yaxley Road lead onto the A140 which to the north links to Norwich and to the south joins the A14 providing routes to Ipswich, Stowmarket and further afield.

Cycle and footpath network

National Cycle Route 30 and National Cycle Route 40, which are on-road routes on the National Cycle Network, run through the Neighbourhood Plan area. The parish also has a well-developed public rights of way network.

Availability of cars and vans

Based on the 2011 census data, 84.0% of households in the Neighbourhood Plan area have access to at least one car or van, which is lower than the percentages for Mid Suffolk (88.7%), but higher than the totals for the South East of England (81.4%) and England (74.2%). The total number of households in the Neighbourhood Plan area with access to at least two cars or vans (36.2%) is less than the total for Mid Suffolk (49.7%) and the South East of England (39.7%) but slightly greater than the total for England (32.0%).

---

88 Sustrans (2019) Map of the National Cycle Network [online] available at: [https://www.sustrans.org.uk/map-ncn](https://www.sustrans.org.uk/map-ncn) [accessed 20/02/19]

89 ONS (no date): 'Car or Van Availability 2011', (Table QS416EW)
Travel to work

The most popular method of travelling to work in the Neighbourhood Plan area is via driving a car or van (39.7%) which is slightly lower than Mid Suffolk (48.5%) and the South East of England (41.3%), but slightly greater than the total for England (36.9%). A lower percentage of residents in the Neighbourhood Plan catch a train, bus, minibus or coach to work in comparison to the regional and national trends. In contrast, a higher proportion of residents work mainly at or from home.

Summary of future baseline

A continued reliance on the private car is highly likely within the Neighbourhood Plan area, particularly given the rural nature of the Neighbourhood Plan area; residents are likely to continue to travel outside of the parish to access a wider range of services and facilities.

New development has the potential to increase traffic and lead to additional congestion issues within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Additionally, public transport use has the potential to remain relatively low compared with private car use. This is likely to be due to the absence of a train station within the Neighbourhood Plan area.