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Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing.
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Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?
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Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?
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### Key Issues

**Broads Authority Natalie Beal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Key issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The AONB and the Broads are not necessarily issues. That implies a negative. Perhaps this chapter could be called 'key considerations'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environment Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Key issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>2096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- On page 4 of the draft Local Plan document we are pleased to see that environmental issues have been included in the key issues section and we fully agree with the points currently made.
- We suggest that the inclusion of water resources could be included into this section as a key environmental issue for the area. More detail is provided in our response to Q21.
- We note that you mention in this section that water quality is decreasing in some areas. The Water Framework Directive (WFD) sets out the need to protect and improve the water environment in its totality, with targets for all water bodies to achieve "good status" and with no deterioration in current status. We recommend that you include a policy supporting these objectives within your emerging local plan.
- Finally there is currently no mention supporting the protection of groundwater and aquifers. We have provided more information on this at the end of the response to questions, in the section headed 'Ground water and Contaminated Land'.
Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Alan Baguste

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 526

Comment a) A balanced mix of rural and small urban areas. Low crime rates. b) The limited amenities are an acceptable price to pay for a quiet, safe and small town that demonstrates an excellent sense of community and self help in many of the areas that are poorly serviced by local and national service providers.
Alex Caswell

Section
Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID
1189

Comment
The village I live in, Lound, is a very small, quiet, rural village. There is a nature reserve within a 15 minute walk of the village and the village has protected species such as bats and barn owls living within the proposed sites for development. The village is quaint and a green amenity for the surrounding urban areas of both Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth. The Lound village is renowned for its traditional surrounding countryside and the peace and quiet of rural Suffolk. The green spaces surrounding and within Lound are a valuable resource to the health of its residents and a much larger population.

The infrastructure in Lound is not supportive of the proposed development sites, even with features such as road widening, the level of traffic going through the village would destroy the character of the village and also present a hazard to the residents.

The village has developed over many years. To propose such a drastic increase in not only the population size (which was only 359 in the 2011 census) by more than doubling the number of houses and the necessary infrastructure to support this, would destroy the carefully nurtured community and the delicate ecosystem. Other surrounding villages that have undergone similar urbanisation, such as Blunderston, have lost their community spirit and the quaint tourist view of a Suffolk village.

The suggested sites for development are completely inappropriate for a village of this size and location. There are few jobs in Lound itself and there are serious environmental and economical concerns in building houses in an area with few jobs which would lead to increased commuters and pollution.
Andrew Nainby

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 956

Comment Delightful rural / coastal area with good balance of facilities and services and low pollution and low crime.
**Anthony Rudd**

**Section** Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

**Comment ID** 1317

**Comment** 1A Good quality of life
1B Good quality of life
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1987

Comment a/b. Waveney provides an attractive and relatively cheap location to live in. There is easy access to Norwich or to open countryside and the Broads. Lowestoft is a compact town and provides a good range of services. Bungay, Beccles and Halesworth have all retained a degree of local character and charm.
Barbara James

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1549

Comment What is good about living in Lound village is, that it's a pretty, quiet nice place to live.
**Brian and Patricia Mitchell**

**Section**  
Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

**Comment ID**  
642

**Comment**  
The good things about living in Lound is the peace and tranquillity of an unspoilt Suffolk village, there are very few of these quaint little villages left, this is the reason we choose to retire here 16 years ago its outrageous to even think our little village could take 213 houses with the sewerage system and extra traffic, we have no facilities the school has been shut and also our post office / shop.
Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 255

Comment 1a & 1b People are friendly. Reasonable pace of life. Lovely countryside. Most things need or want are available. Reasonable public transport. Roads ok to drive. Has a nice feel to area.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1080

Comment Semi rural aspect
**Charles Fortt**

**Section**
Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

**Comment ID**
978

**Comment**
Barnby is an attractive place to live because it is relatively affluent, semi-rural and has low crime and disturbance. Employment is mainly in surrounding towns reached primarily by road, so increased housing development will require improvement to roads to carry the extra volume of traffic.
Christopher Sadler

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 766

Comment 1a - Waveney (and the wider area of East Anglia) is a lovely place to live. It is a beautiful and varied environment.
1b - The village that I live in is very friendly and there is a strong community spirit
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1783

Comment Location near Coast, Broads and spectacular in the main unspoilt countryside. Relatively low crime rates. Excellent voluntary provision of clubs etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTC John Thompson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>It is simply a lovely place to live. Too many local people do not appreciate what we have got here. An award winning beach, lovely parks, picturesque views of the Broads and peace and tranquility. While being at a geographical extremity poses some problems it is also part of its attractiveness and character</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 125

Comment Overlooked to answer b) I have lived in Oulton Broad for nearly 60 years and still love just walking through it. In good weather it is lovely to unwind by sitting by the Broad on Nicholas Everitt Park with a book.
Dr Gemma Mckay

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1218

Comment I love living in Lound as it is a small and rural place perfectly suited to my quiet-loving self. I am extremely fortunate that I get to commute the 20 minutes to work by bicycle right next to a nature reserve. I regularly see people riding their horses by my window, dodging the Houdini-like chickens that escaped from my neighbours garden again. I get to see barn owls and bats in the evenings flying right over my roof. We also have ducks that like to swim in the potholes of our unadopted road (please believe me this is not some plot to get you to adopt our road, I really do like these things!).

In Lound I know my neighbours better than I have anywhere else. We have BBQs, fetes, meetings, pub visits and tea at each other’s houses. I trust them to look after my house while I’m away.

I’m concerned that this will be destroyed by the addition of 138 new houses, an addition which would more than double Lounds population. The character of the village and the green space surrounding it would be eroded, harming not just this village but the communities of Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft who use this as a place to relax and breathe. The impact on the surrounding area's mental health not to mention the wildlife would be severe.
| emma batchelor |
|---|---|
| **Section** | Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in? |
| **Comment ID** | 1052 |
| **Comment** | nice area, friendly people, good variety of shops, jobs available |
Frostenden, Uggeshall & South Cove Parish Council Jean Brown

Section  Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID  1984

Comment  a). The lovely countryside. It is green and varied.
b). As above
G Golding

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 87

Comment a) we enjoy living in an Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty which is incredibly rich in wildlife and protected areas
b) Reydon provides access to beautiful coast and heathland walks and access to the lovely seaside town of Southwold, all of this should be preserved for the future for people to enjoy. Over development could ruin this area and also destroy the revenue that visitors to Southwold generate. Southwold is peculiar in that it engenders a great deal of regular visitors who hold Southwold and its approach dear, and are essential to the future and survival of Southwold and its surrounding areas.
G H Thomas

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 11

Comment There is a balance between the natural and built environment in the area I live in
Geoffrey Nobbs

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 760

Comment Living in Beccles means living in a small typical market town with its own character, unlike nearby large towns. The town will benefit from the Southern Bypass when it is finally built which should take away the heavy vehicles which currently traverse the town on streets which are not designed for them. The town itself is well stocked with local shops as well as National Brands It has a mixture of retirees and active working people a low crime rate and I fear that large scale developments such as those on the Southern side of the town will destroy the character of the town.
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 355

Comment a) The fact that Waveney is an area of low population density. Infrastructure is generally adequate.
b) Beccles is a town which is self sufficient in terms of facilities. The infrastructure is just about adequate for the population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harry Jarvis</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The most important thing for myself and many other villages is that Lound is still a village. This will change dramatically if planning on this scale is allowed. For those without transport one, has to rely on public transport which is very unreliable. Most residents have to commute to work as there are very jobs within the village and the good thing about Lound is that it is still a village. The amount of housing being proposed would finish Lound as a welcoming village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hilary Baker

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 628

Comment I live in Lound which is a small rural village. It is a quiet place where many residents can enjoy views of the countryside. There is a good community spirit here, with many activities locally which are organised and enjoyed by different groups. These include sport, adult education, yoga, pilates, music, and a film club, Lound is a suitable setting for clubs based in towns such as the Great Yarmouth Cycling Club and the Waveney Ramblers who can come and enjoy the quiet lanes and footpaths. The church is active, and many visitors come to see the splendid golden interior. The garden centre, pub and cafe are also popular both with residents and visitors. Lound nursing home provides a tranquil setting for those needing care in later life. It would be difficult to maintain this air of quiet and calm if there was substantial residential development in the village, and I have concerns about where any additional residents would get required services such as schools, doctors and public transport.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>a) Low crime levels, the natural environment and facilities in Bungay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Relatively quiet rural surrounds with a thriving village community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julian Munson

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now?  b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1163

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jackie Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bumpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Eade</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Section**  | Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now?  
<p>|              | b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in? |
| <strong>Comment ID</strong> | 510 |
| <strong>Comment</strong>   | The main element that is good about Beccles is that it is a market town in an essentially rural area. While it has suffered from people retiring there, it still retains its character. In this it is very similar to the other market towns of Waveney. They are very dissimilar from the Lowestoft area which is suffering from a lack of work opportunities. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>John Trew</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | a) The space and opportunity to expand.  
b) transport links are very poor |
Karen Flores

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 812

Comment Q.01 a. I live in Lound and find that for me it is very central to my place of work JPUH. Waveney as a district seems very forward thinking in aspects such as preservation, local wildlife and surroundings. I have easy access to bus routes if I need and all the benefits of the towns as they are so easy to get to. I think parking in Lowestoft is very reasonable and priced accordingly.

Q.01 b. The village I live in is a quintessential English village. This is the reason we choose to live here. It is very quiet and peaceful but at the same time allows easy access to facilities of the town and work. We don't have any crime and it is a safe place to live. It is clean with little or no vandalism and has some wonderful public footpaths which allow me to walk around the country side safely. We also have a great community spirit which is translated by lots of events in the village hall and various church activities.
kevin morgan

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 547

Comment I like the fact the Lound offers peace and quiet in a rural setting along with a small and friendly community. We are lucky to have the standard features that most villages would love to have ie village pond and pub which are the only attractions for the village.
| Larkfleet Homes  
<p>| Seth Williams |
|---|---|
| <strong>Section</strong> | Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in? |
| <strong>Comment ID</strong> | 2143 |
| <strong>Comment</strong> | The primary aspects which are clearly valued by many local residents is the rural character of the majority of the area including its coastline, the Broads and the special landscape in particular of the Waveney and Blyth river valleys. It also has a rich built heritage including in excess of 1600 listed buildings and 14 Conservation Areas covering the historic centres of Lowestoft, Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and Southwold and many of the villages. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesley beevor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Louis Smith

Section: Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID: 565

Comment: Lound is a peaceful, tranquil village. It has a good community spirit with many activities organised at the village hall. There are many footpaths and bridleways for quiet enjoyment of the countryside. There is a good restaurant (The village Maid).
Lound Parish Council John Burford

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1659

Comment Lound Parish Council had an extraordinary Parish Council meeting on 3rd May to discuss our reaction to the Waveney Local Plan consultation. This was attended by Parish Councillors and 30 members of the public, a very large turnout for our small village. Residents agreed that Lound was a peaceful and friendly place to live, with a good community spirit.
Haycock

Section
Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID
878

Comment
I like the proximity to the sea and the generally peaceful atmosphere with low crime levels. The village (Worlingham) has good access to the amenities of the local market town (Beccles). It experiences little crime and anti-social behaviour. It has a community 'feel' despite a shortage of local amenities. The 'public realm' is pleasant and not densely developed.
McGregor

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 980

Comment Beccles is a very quaint slow paced market town on the Broads which is a haven for people to escape from the demands of modern life. Many residents have fled from urban conurbations like London and Norwich to find refuge in a part of the country that can still be considered as english. If the face of Beccles is damaged or removed it will never return and a huge part of this nations heritage will be destroyed for very little gain.
Ms Francis Harvey and Mr Paul Church

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is
good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1611

Comment The good thing about living in Lound is although we are both retired, there
is still a lot of pleasant countryside surrounding Lound, within easy reach of
walking or going for cycle rides. Although the road through the Street is
quite busy, we are only a short distance from several lovely walks, two of
where planning is now suggested.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 647

Comment a) Relatively small and cohesive communities, with easy access to the rural countryside from all major population areas. 
b) I can walk and/or cycle to most places within Lowestoft, and feel safe and secure doing so.
Stuart Precious

Section  Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID  645

Comment  Waveney is a friendly place, my family and I moved to the area from the north of England. We were immediately made welcome. The climate is favourable and the area has a wonderful scenic beauty. We live in Blundeston which is quiet enough away from Lowestoft, yet (with a car or bike) close enough to Lowestoft when needs be. The dynamic of Blundeston being a small friendly and neighbourly village is very special, and should be protected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norman Castleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Blankley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peter Eyres

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1321

Comment Waveney: Attractive market towns each with their own character, independent shops in them, country lanes, pretty villages
Peter Eyres

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1322

Comment Lowestoft: Seaside, Lake Lothing, lifting bridges, broads, church, countryside nearby, two railways serving the town
john norris

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 819

Comment open spaces clean air rich wildlife low crime
Rentplus UK Ltd
Tetlow King Planning  (-)

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1500

Comment As noted on page 4 of the Issues document, policy changes emerging at a national level should be taken into account in formulating the Local Plan and full consideration of the impacts of these on the deliverability of affordable housing and the need for innovative models of affordable housing to be supported. The Government’s consultation on proposed changes to the NPPF explicitly indicated that the affordable housing definition may be amended to incorporate ‘innovative’ rent to buy housing. Though not yet forming policy, the contents of that consultation will need to be thoroughly considered as this raises critical questions about what constitutes affordable housing and how all affordable housing tenures can be delivered as part of the overall housing mix. This is particularly important given the evidence of the Housing and Planning Minister, Brandon Lewis MP, to the CLG Select committee on 24 February 2016 in which he stated that changes to the NPPF would be made “over the course of this summer”. Following the Housing and Planning Act we expect changes, including the introduction of the Starter Homes Regulations, to be made quickly.

We recommend that the following wording be included in the Local Plan vision to reflect the intention of the NPPF and Government agenda focused on extending opportunities for home ownership:

"Enable the delivery of an appropriate mix of market, affordable housing and rent to buy homes that are suitable in tenure, type, size and location to meet identified housing need."

It is also worth noting that the Glossary will need to be updated once any national policy change has been made.
Robert Gill

Section

Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 375

Comment

a) We moved to the area three years ago, because of its beautiful scenery, lovely market towns and the general atmosphere of friendliness and co-operation within the local population. We are very settled here and living here has exceeded our expectations. Since we have moved here, we are aware of other people, similar to ourselves, looking to move. However, it should be recognised that these are people looking for established homes in established settlements. A trawl of the local property market shows that there is ample stock of these types of homes available. We accept that more affordable housing is required, but this could focused within the Lowestoft area.

b) Our village is a close knit community, but sadly not well served by local shops or post office. There are a number of homes for sale in the village, and still opportunities for some infill between existing houses. There have been a number of applications to build on greenfield sites adjacent to the village, the most recent one having being rejected at appeal stage. We strongly believe that the necessary housing stock can be provided elsewhere, rather than detracting further from the village environment. Our decision to move here was influenced to some extent by the current local development plan, showing clearly delineated physical limits of housing. We would oppose any move away from the current physical limits.
Robert Williamson

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now?  b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 488

Comment The good countryside sea, and was a very friendly area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>Relatively low wage economy. Some areas still suffer from bad phone and internet coverage. High proportion of people with disabilities - highest in the county. This needs to be added to the Social issues section. Really important that planning takes account of this and their needs. No student accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1260

Comment a) We live in an area of great beauty with a varied and outstanding natural environment.
b) Southwold and Reydon enjoy economic benefits from tourism and are attractive and well-looked after places, surrounded by AONB.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1909

Comment Question 1a:
- Nature and landscape;
- picturesque villages and market towns;
- the sea;
- good quality local food

Question 1b:
- AONB;
- the sea;
- our built heritage;
- our strong sense of community, albeit beleaguered by an aging, declining population.
- independent businesses that support the community
Terry McDonald

Section: Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID: 94

Comment: Lowestoft is in an ideal location on the east coast. We have some great scenery and are within comfortable traveling distance to Norwich. Our unique selling point right now is location.
Three Saints South Elmham Parish Council Sally Chapman

Section | Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID | 2210

### Webb Information Technology Services Ltd Tony Tibbenham

**Section**  
Q01a) What is good about living or working in Waveney now? b) What is good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

**Comment ID**  
279

**Comment**  
Waveney is a lovely place to live. The recent improvements to A11 up to Norwich have made driving between the Midlands and Lowestoft quicker and easier. There is good variety of leisure facilities and the new cycle paths in Lowestoft, following the A12, should encourage cycling. The range of local theatres is good, if sometimes over-priced compared to Norwich.
Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Alan Baguste

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 527

Comment a) Limited Healthcare resources.
   b) Distance from major hospitals- Emergency services.
**Alex Caswell**

**Section**

Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

**Comment ID**

1191

**Comment**

The only downside to living in Lound is the few and far between passing places for traffic on the single carriageway roads. Such passing places could prevent road rage and traffic accidents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Andrew Nainby</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section  Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID  1988

Comment  a/b. Parts of the district are unaffordable (ie Southwold) although due to restrictive planning policies the affordability problem is spreading to the market towns. Parts are very remote (ie the Saints). Job growth has been slow- with a decline in some areas. Employment opportunities are limited and educational aspiration and achievement is low.
Barbara James

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1550

Comment What’s not so good is that there is very little employment and bad internet and phone connection. The traffic through and around the village is heavily increased. Bus transport is restricted to 3 hours mid-day.
Beccles Town Council C Boyne

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1489

Comment The road infrastructure in the area is very poor and not fit for purpose, the B1127 being a prime example as it is little more than a country lane, as is Ellough Road and most of the others. There is inadequate pedestrian and cycle access to the existing and proposed employment areas at Ellough and no bus service at all.
Brian and Patricia Mitchell

Section  Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID  643

Comment  What is not so good about living in our village now is the threat of housing developments spoiling our village.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section: Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID: 1081

Comment: The continual building of new estates without a corresponding increase in infrastructure or jobs or social facilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Charles Fortt</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1784

Comment Lack of investment in our tourist infrastructure in all areas especially the market towns. Critical lack of indoor swimming pool in Beccles area
Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 143

Comment

a) There are parts of Lowestoft, mainly around London Rd South and Station Square, that need serious work done on them as their dilapidated states gives a very bad first impression of the town. Likewise the railway station. It’s ironically unfortunate we have one of the best - possibly the best - located railway stations in the country yet it can be such a bad introduction to Lowestoft. Also, while it needs keeping in a realistic perspective, not enough is made of the most easterly point in the British Isles. While what has been done was a good effort and a step in the right direction, it is an ironically unattractive location. I realise we need the industry but the unattractiveness of the spot doesn’t make for good publicity for it, not helped by the fact the name of the road leading to it is "Gas Works Rd!!!" Efforts should be made to try to make it more attractive. The other not so good thing is probably something I would feel about living almost anywhere. There is too much traffic and congestion because people are obsessed with using cars. Like everywhere else cars are used far too much for ridiculously short journeys, especially the school run. However, the problem is compounded in Lowestoft by the obsession with the third crossing. The fact is building more roads creates more traffic and congestion in the medium to long-term. In the case of the third crossing it is particularly a case of encouraging more short car journeys. Sadly in supporting a third crossing WDC and SCC are playing up to the general misconceptions that the only practical way to do journeys nowadays is by car, that nobody will consider alternatives and that the only way to resolve congestion and thus promote prosperity is to keep building roads. As a result of a Freedom Of Information request to the Department for Transport I have the details of the assessments and arguments of the case for a third crossing. I refrain from detail but it admits much of the data is unreliable, which leads to so many ‘if’s’ and ‘but’s’ it’s ridiculous. I accept WDC and SCC want to encourage more cycling but the obsession with the third crossing has seriously delayed progress.

b) Basically the same as for the second paragraph above, particularly as I live opposite a school entrance. Many of the parents park up to one hour before finishing time. If they have time to do that they have time to walk. I
suggest waiting time restrictions outside schools.
Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1222

Comment Only that the green bin must now be paid for and the threat of losing the beautiful surrounding areas of Lound so that the council can make more money off it's land while also reaching it's housing quota.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | a). House price inflation caused by proximity to London.  
  b). Lack of facilities. No shop, no pub and poor highway maintenance. |
G Golding

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 88

Comment Poor transport links, few job opportunities, lack of business regeneration and transformation by central and local government for this area. The serious expansion of housing stock will not benefit local people if the above issues are not resolved first. Producing endless holiday homes is not the answer, jobs and homes need to be created in unison. We need people to be able to live and work in the area to create a proper community.
Gill Armstrong

Section  
Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1891

Comment  
If the new parishes go ahead and Lowestoft has a town council a lot of the disjointed work can be dealt with, as I feel, at the moment no one is thinking of the whole area, Waveney is too big and seems not to focus on Lowestoft. Lowestoft has such a lot to offer but is it advertised? No. Is it maintained? No. A town council could focus on the good things and make the most of them. It is an embarrassment taking visitors to Ness Point, the most easterly point in the UK. With the dreadful access and all the dog mess it is hardly an advertisement for Lowestoft. We have an award winning beach but if the rest of the area is not maintained and made the most of the town will die. Major shops are closing, there will be nothing left.
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section  Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID  356

Comment  a) The ongoing threat of large scale development leading to a reduction in quality of life for all.
b) as above
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section  
Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID  
1696

Comment  
a) Job opportunities for the young, coastal erosion and flooding risk.
b) Removal of public transport and broadband availability / speed.
Julian Munson

Section
Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1162

Comment
a. Waveney - Long travel times to work and to major urban centres/retail parks. Limited employment options with higher skilled, higher paid jobs.
b. Rumburgh/Halesworth - Poor local provision of some services - particularly health e.g. nearest hospital 40-45 mins away and high school 9 miles away. Limited sports facilities in nearest market town (Halesworth). Limited local employment options (hence long commutes for many people). Poor broadband in village. Unsafe minor rural roads. Limited public transport through Rumburgh. No cycle paths.
John Bumpus

Section  Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID  574

Comment  Poor infrastructure (roads, health facilities, rail, internet and cycle paths) which is inadequate for the existing population. Low economic growth and low wages, probably related to the execrable connections to areas of higher economic growth. Planned growth should be limited to firm commitments to the required infrastructure being provided in the same timescale.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1796

Comment In March 2012 with the support from the Parish Council, the Neighbourhood Planning Team working with the Community set out to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan for the Parish of Kessingland which defines the spatial planning policy priorities set by the community, which will include the protection of Open Spaces within Kessingland, the retention of the Strategic Gap, to preserve and enhance the quality of life, environmental attributes, economic growth of the neighbourhood and ensure infrastructure is in place to create a sustainable community for future generations through the empowerment of local people. This will be taking into account all representations made during the plan marking process and having regard to all relevant and existing evidence.

The challenges that face the Community are:-

• The loss of young families that leave to access better employment opportunities outside of Kessingland and the associated pressure this puts on the local primary school (due to high numbers of spare places).
• The lack of appropriate public transport, at times when it is needed, to allow those living in Kessingland the ability to access jobs elsewhere.
• A lack of free/affordable community facilities to allow a safe ‘escape’ for the youth of the village.
• To address the needs of older people who live alone in the village.
• The lack of affordable housing which would enable people, particularly young families, to stay in the village.

It is against this background and due to the fact that the Neighbourhood Plan has been forwarded to Waveney District Council in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and Localism Act 2011, that a joint response from the Neighbourhood Planning Team and Parish Council to the new Waveney Local Plan proposals is being made.
Kevin Kinsella

Section
Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 2213

Comment
We simply are not going to get the employment opportunities in Reydon & Southwold that would allow local people working here to be able to afford and occupy the new homes. That being the case, these are going to be dormitory, or second homes, or holiday lets. There are already far too many of these (dormitory, or second homes, or holiday lets) and judging by the facts of the matter, these houses are unaffordably (for local people) highly priced. In all scenarios therefore, there simply must be tight (and stringently enforced) restrictions on the construction of second-homes.
kevin morgan

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 548

Comment There is nothing major that I dislike about the village apart from the traffic which comes through The Street at speed these are rural roads and care should be taken, this problem could lead to a major accident at some point.
Larkfleet Homes  
Seth Williams

**Section**  
Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

**Comment ID**  
2144

**Comment**  
However, residents' primary concerns tend to focus around issues of availability of both jobs and homes, of issues of social deprivation and the lack of community facilities and infrastructure. In respect of homes, particular concerns exist for 'first time buyers', young families and elderly residents seeking to 'downsize'. The ability to own a home remains an unachievable aspiration for many.
Lound Parish Council John Burford

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1660

Comment Lound Parish Council had an extraordinary Parish Council meeting on 3rd May to discuss our reaction to the Waveney Local Plan consultation. This was attended by Parish Councillors and 30 members of the public, a very large turnout for our small village. The drawbacks to living in the village mentioned were a lack of shops, and poor public transport.
Haycock

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 879

Comment 2(a) It saddens me that educational attainment in Waveney schools is below the national averages.
I think that the dash for offshore wind risks blighting coastal views and have concerns about future grid transmission impacts upon the landscape.
Occasional closures (e.g. due to accidents) of the A143 or A146 lead to very long detours.

2(b) There are periodic unpleasant smells from distant industrial sites.
Noisy HGV traffic passes through the village in the early hours of the morning.
Thelma Tasker

Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 876

Comment

Reydon

Whilst appreciating that some housing is needed over the whole country, there are places that are ideal and some that are not. This area I believe belongs in the second category. I think that this consultation is a great PR exercise but I wonder if it is just that. Generally, planning raises the cross bar yearly allowing for a lot more to pass under.

It is very hard not to write too personally as two of the biggest proposed sites are very near to me and will put extreme pressure on an already busy road. I will try to be more objective, on the grounds of fairness and not to be accused of NIMBYism but it is hard when you are trying to preserve your quality of life.

We move to this house some 15 years ago because of the good balance of amenities and the rural element. This has been eroding year on year bringing with it all the things we tried to leave behind us.

I was surprised to see in all your scenarios that the over 65s were seeming to get a fair proportion of the blame for the trouble with housing stocks.

Being one of this group, perhaps you would like us all to fall on our swords so as we could help ease your housing burden!

This area does have a fair amount of housing but this is being squeezed by the second or third or fourth home owners (or even more) and holiday properties.

I always remember what was said to me by the estate agent who sold us this house that Southwold is where people buy houses and Reydon is where they live. Unfortunately, this is no longer the case as people wishing to buy these properties, are being priced out of Southwold and are now buying in Reydon. Fine if you wish to cash in but not if you treasure this as your home and community. I hope that your policy generally includes restricting of this types of ownership.

At least two of the proposed sites are not near enough to town and it’s amenities for easy access without a car or on foot or cycling. It is a reasonably unpleasant walk at present with the number of cars, vans, small lorries, building suppliers, massive lorries, I could go on but I hope I have made my point. Allowing that now a days, most families have two cars it
will mean more traffic and more cars vying for the limited number of parking spaces.

It does worry me that the infrastructure will not be sufficient to accommodate all of these sites. The health centre, I suspect would find it hard to cope and I would think the local schools would also, I’m sure that increased housing would help with your council tax, one of the most unfair taxes around. But this should not come at the expense of the people who live in your district. You appear to be trying to increase the opportunity for work, with what I think will have a detrimental effect on the neighbourhood. The three feeder roads into Southwold are finding it hard to cope already. As more traffic uses it, the situation will only get worse. Your optimism for offshore work in this area might be misplaced and if more work is generated here, then there is no guarantee that the workers will be local but will come from out of town like some already do.

Southwold has become a tourist town, like it or not and when you derive your income from tourism then this does have limited scope for creating jobs.

My main concern is that the total area of proposed development land in Reydon appears to be a quarter to third total area of the town itself. This is not accurate but my judgement from looking at the plan and put in the words of Prince Charles, the proposed site 116/117 could be a ‘carbuncle’ on the village boundary. It’s size and nature could result in it not being cohesive to the ambience of the village.

Your main priority should be to put a second crossing over the water and then decide where you construct your houses.

I have already put in my comments about the St Felix Site.

These are my initial observations and will look forward to more information in the future.

My last comment is just because you can do something, should you?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms Francis Harvey and Mr Paul Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The only thing not so good about living in Lound is that the main street is a through road for traffic travelling to Oulton Broad or Lowestoft, which has increased over the years and will probably continue to do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section

Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 648

Comment

a) Transport within and between the various centres of population is generally poor: not timely and expensive, and useful information is hard to read or come by. Shopping in Lowestoft isn't particularly great (apart from supermarkets: there are plenty of those!). Generally, if I want a pleasant non-supermarket food shopping experience I go elsewhere (mainly to Beccles). As for clothes shopping, there's very little on offer that's remotely interesting or desirable. Finally, the overall feeling of the main centre of Lowestoft and within the region is mostly that most "average" residents are generally poorly paid (though hardworking) and that there is a lack of engagement. It's as if the populations have given up and don't feel that there's much that can be done about it.
b) Lowestoft feels particularly deprived. The main shopping precinct and the High Street are often deserted and/or have a "down at heel" of "bargain basement" feel. There is also a less than welcoming aspect to those living in Lowestoft (to anyone not originally from the area); and a very real divided sensibility (the North - South divide is quickly obvious). I feel that this is holding the town back.
Nicky Elliott

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 717

Comment Poor public transport in villages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norman Castleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 276

Comment There seems to be an adherence to the belief that fishing matters in modern Lowestoft. People who belief this should wake-up and realise that fishing is essentially finished and is now only small time. New business ahs to be encouraged to come to the area. High tech industry can be located anywhere these days and I would like to see more effort to encourage this form of business development.
P Cunningham

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1557

Comment Lound - Rubbish near college. Big buses and traffic college.
P Cunningham

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1559

Comment Lound - Roads do not support college traffic won’t help making village twice the size it is. Wot does the village gain! Spoil church and allotments.
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 49

Comment Transport within Beccles is becoming an increasing issue especially at school times and Saturday mornings, and any road closures or restrictions on routes into town and in the centre have a disproportionate effect at any time of the day. The gradual expansion of homes over the years including the absorption of Worlingham into Beccles has added to the pressure on its amenities, and this is increased by the expansion of nearby villages in both Norfolk and Suffolk, as many of those also use Beccles. There are limited facilities in Worlingham, and this along with the expansion of Beccles to the south and east means that there are an increasing number of journeys into the town centre, and the lack of good safe cycle paths means that many of these are by car. The Health Centre, good schools, and sporting facilities are all reaching their capacity, and there needs to be significant thought as to how all the infrastructure can be improved to cope with further expansion of the town.
Peter Eyres

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1415

Comment Q2a Lack of aspiration, obesity  
Q2b Litter, too many cars, too many supermarkets and low-grade ones at that, lack of care for historic assets
**Section**

Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

**Comment ID**

820

**Comment**

high unemployment low wages
As noted on page 4 of the Issues document, policy changes emerging at a national level should be taken into account in formulating the Local Plan and full consideration of the impacts of these on the deliverability of affordable housing and the need for innovative models of affordable housing to be supported. The Government's consultation on proposed changes to the NPPF explicitly indicated that the affordable housing definition may be amended to incorporate 'innovative' rent to buy housing. Though not yet forming policy, the contents of that consultation will need to be thoroughly considered as this raises critical questions about what constitutes affordable housing and how all affordable housing tenures can be delivered as part of the overall housing mix. This is particularly important given the evidence of the Housing and Planning Minister, Brandon Lewis MP, to the CLG Select committee on 24 February 2016 in which he stated that changes to the NPPF would be made "over the course of this summer". Following the Housing and Planning Act we expect changes, including the introduction of the Starter Homes Regulations, to be made quickly.

We recommend that the following wording be included in the Local Plan vision to reflect the intention of the NPPF and Government agenda focused on extending opportunities for home ownership:

"Enable the delivery of an appropriate mix of market, affordable housing and rent to buy homes that are suitable in tenure, type, size and location to meet identified housing need."

It is also worth noting that the Glossary will need to be updated once any national policy change has been made.
Robert Gill

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 376

Comment The continuing uncertainty over where new housing development is to be situated. This detracts from current enjoyment of one's environment. The constant pressure from local developers to submit planning applications for building on greenfield sites and refusal to accept that these sites are outside the physical limits of development. We appreciate WDC’s robust application of the physical limits.
Robert Williamson

**Section**

Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

**Comment ID**

497

**Comment**

The bad firms like matthews who pay low wages have bought in hundreds of people from EU this has had the effect of forcing pay down to min wage and have push up house rent so most local people who do not get benefits can not afford to pay the high rents and the council and its partners have not been building enough social housing and the local car parking is being used as a cash cow to spend in Lowestoft
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1051

Comment To earn a decent wage my husband has to travel over 120 miles. There are no jobs for me (I'm an expert in clothing design and construction) so no work for me, except the odd bit. Rail links to London are slow, I will normally go to Diss and park. No decent leisure centre, I have to travel to Lowestoft. Notice these all create car journeys which we are loathed to do as I like to cycle were possible. Our neighbours also travel long distances for work.

A destinked lack of restaurants and bars. People from the surrounding area love to come to Beccles as it’s so quaint and unspoilt, but needs more quality independents like 'Graze' at the White Horse.

A lack of camping facilities as this is a major tourist hub and families like to camp or tour.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Clean air, beautiful countryside and coastline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
slatter

Section  Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID  67

Comment  poor roads
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 1261

Comment a) There is significant deprivation in the District, particularly in Lowestoft where employment continues to decline.
b) Local people in Southwold and Reydon, employed in the relatively low pay sectors of tourism and services related to tourism and second homes including building, are largely priced out of the local housing market.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section  Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID  1910

Comment  Question 2a:
- Poor public transport connecting villages and towns and London;
- Broadband is not as good as it should be for working purposes;
- Discouraged from using Lowestoft because of bridge access issues;
- Lack of well paid jobs – overdependence on tourism;
- Lack of facilities for knowledge based businesses;
- In Waveney, especially Lowestoft, state education is not as good as it should and could be;
- Lack of maintenance of footpaths, green spaces, including litter;
- Loss of community hospital provision.

Question 2b:
- Lack of facilities for knowledge based businesses
- Lack of facilities for community assets
- High rents which discourage independent businesses, small businesses and start-up businesses
- Lack of affordable homes even with Duncan's Yard coming on–stream;
- Lack of rental accommodation at a reasonable price for people whose income does not qualify them for affordable social housing. Most rental accommodation is for holiday lets.
- 57% of housing is second homes/holiday lets
- Declining and elderly/very elderly population
- Lack of volunteers undermining essential services and civic life
- Inadequate parking system – too many cars in town during high season. Pavements and streets not safe for pedestrians/cyclists.
- Over-dependence on tourism
- Too many people using the town in the summer without the physical facilities and resources to service them and maintain the town. This relates to infrastructure inadequacies in the broadest sense too.
- Difficulty of recruiting employees because of lack of affordable housing and poor public transport system.

(Currently, three restaurants/food producers are advertising for staff.)
Terry McDonald

Section Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 95

Comment Lowestoft feels very quiet and inward looking. We are more a retirement town than a destination. Lack of investment shows in aspirations and poverty levels.
Three Saints South Elmham Parish Council Sally Chapman

Section
Q02a) What is not so good about living and working in Waveney now? b) What is not so good about living or working in the town or village you live in?

Comment ID 2211

Comment
b) Poor access to healthcare facilities. Population becoming older as young families move to the towns. Limited travel and shopping options for non-drivers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Traffic snarl ups when the bridge goes up stop the entire Lowestoft town. The new traffic lights serving Commercial Road cause even more delay. The A12 to the south is too slow for regular commuting, especially between Lowestoft and Ipswich.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Alan Baguste

**Section**

Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

**Comment ID**

528

**Comment**

a) The mix of coastal and rural communities remain separated although accessible and do not become amalgamated into ribbon developments (viz. M62 corridor).

b) That development, particularly housing, is managed with the wishes and preferences of the local population providing a major contribution to the direction of long term plans.
Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1202

Comment

My vision for Lound by 2036 is for it to retain its traditional and rural character. Any development undertaken in Lound should be natural growth necessary for the needs of the village, rather than imposed as part of Waveney’s plan to meet a housing quota. The sites proposed are not sustainable development for the village and its community spirit. The development’s benefits are far outweighed by the negative impact the development would have on the surrounding rural countryside (which is an asset for the health of both residents and neighbouring urbanised areas), the character of the traditional village, the protected species and other wildlife living in Lound and the surrounding areas. The developments would also negatively impact on the Lound housing market, those who buy houses and live in Lound do so for the traditional village as it is today. If another 138 houses and the necessary supporting infrastructure is built people will leave Lound and the area. In short the suggested sites for development are ill-thought out, rash and completely inappropriate if we wish to retain the traditional, beneficial, rural areas of Lound. Waveney have not considered the value of green spaces and small communities that provide Suffolk and this area with much needed tourism and areas that protect and improve the mental well-being of the surrounding population.

I strongly object to the development sites proposed for the village of Lound on the above facts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Audrey Grapes**

**Section**
Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

**Comment ID** 1553

**Comment** Lound - Impossible to envisage 2036, I have seen many changes. I guess villages will have disappeared – and I'll be long gone!
Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1989

Comment The new housing market is dysfunctional. Nearly all the allocations in the former local plan have failed to come forward as they are either unattractive or uneconomic to develop. This is resulting on demand being focused on a few locations and upward pressure on prices. Whilst regeneration of the Lake Lothing area should be a priority the approach taken so far has not worked. Either significant public funding is needed to kick start this or the approach needs reconsidering. The housing market would benefit from a number of allocations around the district – not a highly concentrated allocation in Lowestoft and with proper consideration given to the likelihood of delivery.
Barbara James

Section

Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1551

Comment Vision. – Some brown site infill may be needed especially for young people who wish to live here. The Government does have a 'brown site' first policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>The vision of our village in 2036 and beyond is exactly as it is now an unspoilt quiet country village with a small community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1536

Comment We hope that the Broads will be mentioned in some way in the vision and objectives.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section
Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1785

Comment
Bring in more diverse industries and employment and not rely as we are currently doing on renewable energy which is very short term in the greater scheme of things. We need more high-tec business as our road infrastructure is very poor we need goods and services that are easy to transport. Build high quality high value housing on the prime riverside/seafront sites that bring wealthy people who have large disposable incomes and their business with them. Look at other deprived areas such as Bristol, London Docks, Liverpool, Manchester the list is endless all exploiting their docks and waterfronts. Growth without loosing character
**CTC John Thompson**

**Section**

Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

**Comment ID** 148

**Comment**

a) That there will be more employment created through the use of alternatives to the car. Thus physically Waveney will not have changed and not have it's unique beauty and character and tranquility ruined by the building of dual, even three-lane carriageway roads. Despite the protests of the road/car lobby they are not needed. Retaining that character will help the economy by encouraging tourism. Particularly cycle-tourism needs to be encouraged as cycle-tourists tend to spend more. So far WDC has made 'sound bites' and gestures for encouraging cycle tourism but has far from committed to a serious study.

b) Basically as above but I particularly want more people walking and cycling. It improves quality of life for everyone and ultimately DOES help the economy more than continually providing for the car.
Dr Gemma Mckay

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1224

Comment I'll copy what my partner said here as I couldn't put it better myself:
My vision for Lound by 2036 is for it to retain its traditional and rural character. Any development undertaken in Lound should be natural growth necessary for the needs of the village, rather than imposed as part of Waveney's plan to meet a housing quota. The sites proposed are not sustainable development for the village and its community spirit. The development’s benefits are far outweighed by the negative impact the development would have on the surrounding rural countryside (which is an asset for the health of both residents and neighbouring urbanised areas), the character of the traditional village, the protected species and other wildlife living in Lound and the surrounding areas. The developments would also negatively impact on the Lound housing market, those who buy houses and live in Lound do so for the traditional village as it is today. If another 138 houses and the necessary supporting infrastructure is built people will leave Lound and the area. In short the suggested sites for development are ill-thought out, rash and completely inappropriate if we wish to retain the traditional, beneficial, rural areas of Lound. Waveney have not considered the value of green spaces and small communities that provide Suffolk and this area with much needed tourism and areas that protect and improve the mental well-being of the surrounding population. I strongly object to the development sites proposed for the village of Lound on the above facts.
Section

Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1053

Comment priorities for town.. more job opportunities, keeping wildlife areas/fields not having every open space built on
Environment Agency

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 2097

Comment Our focus over this period is to protect, maintain and enhance the natural environment in Waveney and the surrounding area; and, ensure environmentally sustainable development. Key priorities will be to:

1) Improve biodiversity, to help ensure development respects existing wildlife corridors to link rivers, lakes, wetlands and coastal habitats and develops new ones. This will help to reduce the impacts of climate change on biodiversity, enabling species to move as environmental conditions alter. People benefit from flourishing wildlife and there is a direct link between environmental quality and human health and well-being.

2) Protect and improve regeneration of groundwater as an important resource that we rely on. This provides the majority of drinking water; sustains baseflow and ecology in our rivers; and supports lakes and wetlands and their ecosystems. This Local Plan can help to ensure that groundwater is protected and where necessary improved during regeneration and development.

3) Support good Waste and resource management to encourage economic growth. Good waste and resource management will help prevent local impacts on the environment. Globally the management of waste makes an important contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and access to finite resources. Locally, waste management activities that are poorly run can pollute the environment, cause harm to human health and generate nuisance impacts for local communities. Illegal waste activity can blight local areas as well as polluting the environment and causing harm to human health. Waste and resource management can also support economic growth and the creation of new jobs.

4) Ensure new developments are resilient over their lifetime to flood risk and coastal change, including the impact of climate change and improve the sustainability of existing communities. Flood risk and coastal change are existing threats which will be made worse by climate change. Managing flood risk and coastal change can also improve the economic prospects of communities and improve the environment.

5) Improve the high quality water environment to support wildlife but also
provide quality of life benefits and support local economies including boosting land values, agriculture, tourism and recreation. The significance of the Broads has to be recognised, the coastal environment, tourism and the benefits that tourism brings to the area. New development can increase pressure on the water environment. This pressure arises from point sources, such as waste water treatment works, and diffuse pollution sources such as urban water runoff.

6) Water resources are critical to underpinning sustainable economic growth and housing development as well as supporting the natural environment. Increasing population and climate change will impact on the water resources in future and improvements to the systems would be encouraged.
Frostenden, Uggeshall & South Cove Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1986

Comment a). The key priorities must be the regeneration of Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth and the third river crossing for Lowestoft.
b). To create a better sense of community.
G Golding

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 89

Comment Dramatically improving public transport, building homes in the right place where there are jobs and on brownfield sites. Protection of open space and greenfield area, by investing in housing and jobs where there are good transport links and economic need.
G H Thomas

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 12

Comment My vision for 2036 is to leave where I live in a better state than it is now. Change must happen but it needs to genuinely be for the better and not what has been put together as a political vote maker of building houses. The need for new housing is not as great as people think, but successive governments have made this a priority as it is the only money making venture that Britain currently has and in the short term makes people feel better. Allow local people in areas decide on what extra house building is required and the infrastructure needed to sustain that. This will backing up with help form central government.
Harry Jarvis

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 802

Comment My vision for 2036 is to see Lound very much as it is today unspoilt by the spread of large housing estates which this proposal would mean. I have no objection to some housing within the village infill and brownfield sites (i.e. Manor Farm) possibly the old school site.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1902

Comment The Vision for the district should make reference to the rich historic environment of the District and the need to develop a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of this environment. In particular the vision should be relate to the distinctiveness of the district, including that of its historic environment.
Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1697

Comment a) A variety of businesses offering job opportunities and a secure protected environment.

b) A community that continues to thrive, where the residents feel safe and there are transport links into the town. Also where those businesses located in the village can function effectively on-line.
Jennifer Francis

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1435

Comment I've recently moved to Lowestoft (6 years ago) and I've seen a steady decline in the area in this short space of time. I have recently picked up one of your brochures - HELP PLAN OUR FUTURE. Now I would just like to take this opportunity to point out to you that you are planning a downwards spiral for the whole area. We as a family had originally hoped to spend the rest of our life in Lowestoft because as far as the natural surroundings go it has got an awful lot going for it. However if the level of decline continues as fast as it has done in the last 6 years we may have to review our plans - and I'm sure we aren't the only ones with these thoughts.

'Now I would just like you to take a minute to think about what kind of place you are trying to make Lowestoft.'

1. A pleasant seaside resort with plenty to attract tourists.
2. A seaside town surrounded by grotty houses, no tourist attractions, high levels of unemployment and only £1.00 shops to visit.

Unfortunately we are heading towards option No.2 extremely rapidly. There is absolutely no reason to come to Lowestoft unless you are happy to sit on the beach and do nothing or you want an extremely cheap house. Now all I have ever heard the Waveney District Council talk about is 'AFFORDABLE HOUSING'!! - and to make it worse this is all you are building. This in turn attracts low class, uneducated, maybe unemployed/unemployable residents. This just makes matters worse all round - higher crime rates, drugs, alcohol problems etc.... It would be far far better to concentrate on bringing some quality businesses and tourist attractions to the area which will provide employment for varying ages and abilities. This will attract people and will also in turn make our Lowestoft residents more attractive.

Why does London still have residents when the house prices are so much higher? - they have higher class residents and this is exactly what you need to be working towards instead of driving the town to the ground!!!!!! - affordable housing means-unemployable people-which means high levels of reproduction - which means more problems all round.

I'd just like you to think about this and really consider what kind of place
you would like Lowestoft to be in 10 years time.
I'm afraid there is absolutely nothing in Lowestoft that attracts me one tiny little bit except the beach. I'd rather drive to Beccles and shop with some nicer people than bother to go to Lowestoft and shop with the lowest of the low that are only getting lower because of the whole way that the town is going.

Thank you for your time and I do understand you have some hard decisions to make but I do also think you need to start looking outside the box and making some radical changes.
John Bumpus

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 575

Comment Priority for the village is to preserve its rural peace and tranquility and try to ensure that the B1062 has at least the provision of a safe pedestrian footpath to Beccles. Ideally, it would be a multi-use path to allow cycles to avoid the danger of this fast road and allow more safe cycling, particularly for school age children.

For Beccles the aim must be to protect it from over development stemming from its attractiveness compared to other population centres.

For Lowestoft, I have no idea what can be done to address its infrastructural and employment issues.
**John Trew**

**Section**

Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

**Comment ID** 14

**Comment**

There is obviously a great need for new housing but careful thought must be given to the density of the housing. Too dense a level of housing, particularly in the case of starter homes, would inevitably lead to parking mayhem. Green areas are a must as are green barriers between new and existing housing.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1798

Comment
In 2030, Kessingland is an easily accessible village where many of the community use local transport to get around. It has maintained and improved the levels of inclusivity among both the young and the older members of the community, through shared activities as well as established meeting places such as the skatepark, playing fields, beaches and community centre.

Kessingland has become a place where young people can grow up and can stay when they start a family. This is because new housing has addressed their needs and it has ensured that local people have had first refusal of the new affordable properties when they are built.

The development of new housing at the former Ashleys Nurseries site and adjacent to this on land at Laurel Farm has provided affordable housing which is accessible to the people of Kessingland. It has also created new market housing which has allowed both young families and older "downsizers" to buy property that they want within the village. This has brought more young people and children into the village, so avoiding Kessingland simply becoming a retirement village, whilst also increasing numbers of local children at the local school, and thus ensuring its long term future.

The proceeds from development have provided strong benefits for the community by way of improved infrastructure, including expanded sports facilities. The development at Laurel Farm has enabled expansion of the Community Playing Field and the sports facilities that serve it. The network of pedestrian and cycle paths serving the two new housing developments have been well linked to the existing village so that the new facilities are well used by existing residents.

The economy has been strengthened by the provision of "small" incubator units on the former Ashley Nurseries for start up businesses to establish themselves to thrive. The protection of existing businesses and the local tourism, will add to the local economy meaning that there will more employment opportunities for young adults to stay in Kessingland.
kevin morgan

Section
Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 549

Comment
Lound 2036! Well I hope it remains a "small village", too many villages and small little communities have been lost to greedy developers. People pay a premium to live in a village such as Lound, I suspect like me they are looking to get away from all the problems that comes with living on an estate in a city.

Given my response to the first three questions and speaking to other residents, I don’t expect these development plans will be well received by the local community.
**Larkfleet Homes**  
**Seth Williams**

**Section**  
Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036?  
b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

**Comment ID**  
2145

**Comment**  

* The Vision should state clearly what the aspirations for the District are and lead to clearly defined objectives to achieve this.  
The consultation paper is seeking to establish a vision for the future of the District to 2036. The vision should underpin the strategic objectives which provide the backbone to the Plan itself. It is important that the vision is clear such that the objectives derived from it can be specific, realistic, measurable and deliverable.  
It is clear from our involvement with the area that local residents have many reasons to value their towns, villages and the District in general but it is equally clear that there are numerous concerns and reservations that they would wish to see addressed.  
The District continues to suffer from a high rate of unemployment, with a rate higher than that of both the County and the national average. The average annual wage is also below both the regional and national averages. It is clear therefore that the vision for the Local Plan must seek to support both a substantial level of new housing growth and support and encourage significant economic growth in the area.

With respect to Beccles, the aspiration must be to maintain the vitality and character of the historic market town which is highly valued by its residents and visitors alike.  
Through the course of our client’s public engagement to date, it is evident that the concerns regarding lack of availability of housing and jobs are as relevant to Beccles as the wider Waveney area. In particular, at Beccles, with respect to homes, there is apparently a demand locally for 'starter homes' and homes for the elderly including bungalows or a retirement community.  
Other issues arising which are specific to Beccles concern the perceived inadequacy or lack of community facilities; in particular healthcare provision, a community centre/indoor sports hall, primary school, bus services, new shops, useable green open space playing fields and allotments.  
We submit that the vision for Waveney's new local plan should be seeking
to address these issues by seizing on the opportunities the District offers and maintaining its special and distinctive character and qualities. A fundamental component of the emerging Plan, and one of its key visions must be to meet the full identified need for new housing, and infrastructure to support, over the period to 2036.
Lesley Beevor

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 775

Comment Infrastructure improvements are made throughout the district prior to new developments
Louis Smith

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 566

Comment My vision for Lound is that it should stay as a small, quiet village. Any development should be small in scale, and within the existing character of the village.
Lound Parish Council John Burford

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1661

Comment Lound Parish Council had an extraordinary Parish Council meeting on 3rd May to discuss our reaction to the Waveney Local Plan consultation. This was attended by Parish Councillors and 30 members of the public, a very large turnout for our small village. The generally expressed vision for the future of Lound is that it should remain as it is now, with only organic growth that doesn't change the character of the village. New housing development should be concentrated in existing towns preferably on brown-field sites, and not in rural areas on green-field sites.
Margaret Dinn

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1438

Comment With the exception of site no. 142 (the old Southwold police and fire stations), I believe that none of the proposed sites should be considered for development. After taking into account the planned development at Duncans's Yard (20 homes), I believe that the number of homes required under Scenario 1, Option 1 could be easily fulfilled over the next 20 years by: i/ the small-scale development of the various brown field sites that will become available in Southwold, i.e. the old Southwold Hospital, the telephone exchange, the old Kings Head pub, etc; and iii/ various small infill developments in Southwold and Reydon. The most obvious site for any large development in Reydon would be the site to the north of Keens Lane. This area, which was cited in Waveney’s Site Specific Allocations and Options document in December 2006 (179 homes), seems the most logical area for an "organic" expansion of the village and already has a number of access roads. Southwold and Reydon do not need any more second/holiday homes. Any new homes should be council properties made available to locals. This is the only way to ensure that the "right homes" are built for the "right" people. Past attempts to include affordable or key worker housing in recent developments in the area have been exploited by unscrupulous individuals who have "flipped" these properties to make a quick profit. Finally, I only stumbled upon the details of the new Waveney Local Plan by accident and a number of my neighbours in Keens Lane only became aware of the proposals contained in the plan after I informed them. People need to know about proposals that have the potential to totally change the character of Reydon. It does not seem unreasonable to ask the landowners who have put forward land for development to fund a mailshot to every household in Southwold and Reydon.
Haycock

Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 880

Comment 3(a)
I think Waveney needs to refresh itself and become more ambitious for local people, particularly younger people.
Improving educational attainment to above national averages should be a priority.
Offshore wind should be seen as a means to an end (i.e. developing a high-skilled engineering base) rather than as an end in itself.
Informal and formal links to Norwich should be strengthened, particularly regarding the arts (a sphere singularly ignored in the background documents to this consultation). For example, rural or coastal venues for creative-writing residential workshops could be established. Similarly for painting and other creative endeavours.
Imaginative architectural projects for Lowestoft should be sought through competitions with prizes.
(Perhaps council employees should visit Rotterdam and meet their opposite numbers to get ideas about how a place can embrace the future in a creative way. Look up Rotterdam's 'cube houses' on the internet for an example.)
In a digital world, physical location matters less than before. This fact should be exploited to better effect than just building 'call centres'.
Nature conservation bodies should be supported and encouraged to raise their profiles as this will feed into both well-being and tourism.
Tourism should be eased 'up-market', building upon the status of Southwold and by avoiding the drowning of market towns by high-density peripheral developments.
A District policy for elderly housing (e.g. retirement communities) should be developed and implemented using national guidance. Given the ageing population, this is urgent and highly relevant to this area.

3(b)
I would like to see Worlingham retain its village identity and not be subsumed by Beccles.
I don't want it to be blighted by industry-related 'through' traffic.
It's 'public realm' should be protected against high-density new housing
developments and its growth kept proportionate to its size within the District.
McGregor

Section  Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID  984

Comment  There is no real opportunity for industry in this area other than what already exists. The town needs to focus on the tourism industry. It is quite unique with its access to the Broads and also to the open countryside for cycling. Both of these areas are very underplayed. There is not even a bar or restaurant at the marina and some local roads could be classified as 'quiet lanes' as done around Cromer.
Ms Francis Harvey and Mr Paul Church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Hopefully the vision for Lound up to 2036 will be for it to remain as it is now as a pleasant village, although 2036 is rather far ahead in the future, it would be nice for Lound to still remain a small quiet village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 649

Comment a) We need to get to grips with providing more employment and educational opportunities for the future. We also need more affordable housing options.

b) Lowestoft needs to ensure that new housing developments have decent services and/or transport links between those and other sections of the town. New housing also needs to be i) affordable; ii) a decent size (i.e. not a rabbit hutch without decent cupboard space); iii) near to other amenities.
Natural England

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 2195

Comment The Plan's vision and strategy
Natural England advises that the Plan's vision and emerging development strategy should address impacts and opportunities for the natural environment with particular emphasis on designated environmental assets. The plan should take a strategic approach to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment and aim for a net gain for biodiversity considering opportunities for enhancement and improving connectivity. Where relevant there should be linkages with the Biodiversity Action Plan, Nature Improvement Area, Local Nature Partnership, National Park/Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plans, Rights of Way Improvement Plans and Green Infrastructure Strategies.
Norman Castleton

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 235

Comment Good use made of the portside access and facilities. The growth of associated industries and facilities. Plus reactivation of the High Street. Improved communications including the third crossing. The greening of the town and suburbs with environmentally friendly planned housing areas. Expanded educational facilities for all ages with centres of learning excellence.
Norman Castleton

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 277

Comment A real effort to improve educational opportunities and the quality of education in the town. A more compact urban environment with less development on the fringes. A growth of technology and environmental based industries with good value jobs and careers.
P Cunningham

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1558

Comment Lound - To continue to be a small nice place to live!
Pamela Cyprien

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1256

Comment I feel that Lowestoft should be developed in terms both of business and housing, many parts of which are very run down. And perhaps more houses in Beccles which is already a good business area. If this was done there would be little need of further housing in Reydon and Southwold above what is already planned, as there little business to justify more housing. What we do need (and in part is currently planned for) are affordable and one/two bedroom houses for younger people and those wishing to downsize. We do not need four/five bedroom houses as these invariably end up as second homes or holiday lets which affects the sustainability of the area.
Paul Douch

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 853

Comment a) Controlled growth of housing and economic development. The District Council should continue to maintain control over development because developers and other interested parties (eg caravan sites) will try to build in more places and in excessive unit numbers than socially appropriate. Reduced car use per head. Preservation of essential character of rural and coastal areas. Tourism - improve what facilities exist rather than build more or grant more caravan sites/ extensions.

b) Preservation of character of Somerleyton. But small-scale development not to be ruled out, so that key community facilities (school, pub, post office/shop, village hall) can survive & thrive
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 50

Comment Waveney needs to concentrate on the needs of its existing population rather than the needs of new residents. The infrastructure needs to be improved to cope with existing and future development. New development should concentrate on smaller properties for both the younger and older residents. Good sized green spaces that promote relaxation and leisure should be included in the plans to help create a sense of community rather than the feeling of being a small piece of an ever increasing conurbation. The priorities for Beccles should be: Improved retail and leisure facilities for the south and east of the town, possibly including a park and ride option to the town centre. A limited managed increase in housing concentrating on existing older and younger housing needs. Improvements to the transport in the town including practical and safe cycle and pedestrian routes.
Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 821

Comment i would like to see lowestoft centre redeveloped.
i would like to see the major roads around Beccles linked up without having to come through the narrow roads of the town
Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1502

Comment

As noted on page 4 of the Issues document, policy changes emerging at a national level should be taken into account in formulating the Local Plan and full consideration of the impacts of these on the deliverability of affordable housing and the need for innovative models of affordable housing to be supported. The Government's consultation on proposed changes to the NPPF explicitly indicated that the affordable housing definition may be amended to incorporate 'innovative' rent to buy housing. Though not yet forming policy, the contents of that consultation will need to be thoroughly considered as this raises critical questions about what constitutes affordable housing and how all affordable housing tenures can be delivered as part of the overall housing mix. This is particularly important given the evidence of the Housing and Planning Minister, Brandon Lewis MP, to the CLG Select committee on 24 February 2016 in which he stated that changes to the NPPF would be made "over the course of this summer". Following the Housing and Planning Act we expect changes, including the introduction of the Starter Homes Regulations, to be made quickly.

We recommend that the following wording be included in the Local Plan vision to reflect the intention of the NPPF and Government agenda focused on extending opportunities for home ownership:

"Enable the delivery of an appropriate mix of market, affordable housing and rent to buy homes that are suitable in tenure, type, size and location to meet identified housing need."

It is also worth noting that the Glossary will need to be updated once any national policy change has been made.
Robert Gill

Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 377

Comment
To add to the regeneration of Lowestoft by taking advantage of the opportunities of the offshore wind industry. In particular, to regenerate the High Street and its retail offering.

We should protect farmland for growing crops and livestock rather than building on it. There are sufficient brownfield sites available and developing these within Lowestoft, together with developing supporting infrastructure, will help to regenerate Lowestoft.

In the event that the forthcoming referendum about membership of the EU results in a 'leave' vote, the pressure to produce our own food may increase. The planned increase in population in the Waveney area will also increase pressure to produce more food.
Robert Williamson

Section  Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID  500

Comment  More social housing for the youngsters that work not for the single mothers, drugees, and workshy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosemary Simpson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 604

Comment We need to properly plan for older people, use public transport as a hub for development eg railway stations and bus routes. I think we are doing things back to front and should look at existing infrastructure first and plan for development around it. New development can help upgrade systems. A systems approach rather than a traditional approach is what is needed. This would also help rural areas.

We need to create a flourishing economy too. Look at innovative ways to create work and create community hubs.

Protecting our historic and ecological assets is really important.

Try to plan for climate change resilience - not easy I admit, and make sustainable building the core principle for new development of all kinds.

Student accommodation is very important for young people to flourish and live independently.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>slatter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordable rural housing, improved roads and infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce Guy Mitchell

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1694

Comment Summary
We believe that the Development Plan should reflect the value of Southwold and Reydon to the wider area. In formulating the plan, it will be important to gain a balance between the needs of residents and the needs of the economy. Above all, it is essential to retain the character of the area. If the right balance is achieved, Southwold and Reydon will be a vibrant community to live in, to work in and to visit.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section  
Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1277

Comment  
We want to see a more vibrant local economy, taking full advantage of the opportunities arising from off-shore wind but also seeking to expand knowledge-based businesses in the area, including in small towns and villages like Southwold and Reydon, which sustains the community. More housing, particularly affordable and smaller units of low-cost commercial housing, is needed in Southwold and Reydon in order to maintain a balanced and sustainable community.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1420

Comment 1. Principles/Vision

We believe that any approach to planning the future of our built environment must begin with the vision we have for our community. Southwold is a vibrant market town with an economy dominated by tourism and our local brewery but which maintains a lively high street with many independent shops and hosts a range of successful small businesses, ranging from building contractors to domestic services and to design and knowledge-based enterprises. Reydon is an adjoining village, closely interlinked with Southwold, but with a growing population and services of its own, notably the health service and fire safety provision shared with Southwold, its own printing and manufacturing businesses, and three shops. In both Southwold and Reydon, a growing proportion of housing is used as second homes or holiday let businesses and many residents are retired; the area contains the most elderly population in the Waveney and Yarmouth health area. Southwold and Reydon are surrounded by a very special environment, made up of sea, coastline, estuary, reedbeds, heathland, woods and open countryside – all of which thoroughly deserves its designation as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and some of which is nationally important.

Our vision is to preserve and protect the character and amenity of our community and environment but that cannot be achieved by allowing it to stand still. There are challenges to be faced in balancing the needs and interests of visitors and temporary residents with that of the resident population, not least ensuring that enough younger people and families live in our area to support the needs of the ageing population and that those brought up here have a realistic chance of finding housing and work to allow them to sustain a viable family life. Balance, too, is needed in employment so that those aspiring to work in the "knowledge" economy have opportunities as well as those working in tourism and related services. We need to find a balance in key aspects of the local infrastructure, especially in transport and parking and drainage and sewerage – all of which are under pressure and may be beyond their capacity especially at peak visitor periods. The protection of our natural environment, including
managing the risks and consequences of coastal erosion, must be balanced with the need to accommodate a growing population and the creation of a wider range of employment. Failure to meet these challenges will result in an unsustainable community and thus undermine the features of our area that we wish to preserve.

Our response to the Local Plan consultation is, therefore, primarily concerned with meeting these challenges and preserving a balance that ensures our community remains vibrant and viable into the future.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section

Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? 
b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID

1911

Comment

Question 3a:
• More knowledge based business facilities (innovation centres), located in town centres or within walking distance, which is where knowledge based businesses want to be.
• More affordable housing;
• Better education and training, including expansion of further and higher education opportunities to enable young people in Waveney to take advantage of the opportunities provided by expansion of knowledge based businesses, or of the opportunity potentially offered by Sizewell C. This will also redress the demographic imbalance of the District, which has a high rate of in-migration from retired people.
• Better public transport (an infrastructure concern)
• Better broadband (an infrastructure concern)
• Third crossing
• Better protection of environment, AONB, and heritage assets
• Better design (including landscaping) of all development.

Question 3b:
• Integrate knowledge based business units into the town centre – this creates year round footfall to support shops that provide for ordinary needs and serve the resident community. This enhances the vitality of the town centre by creating a more balanced mixture of retail offer for people who live and work locally, not just those visiting the town.
• More affordable homes – prevent loss of Waveney social housing, along with building additional affordable homes.
• Restrict and discourage second homes/holiday lets/buy to invest through legally imaginative solutions.
• Support affordable retail and business units for start-up, micro and small businesses. See Questions 45-48
• More space for community facilities. These draw people into the town, creating year round footfall.
• High quality design throughout the town, even outside Conservation Areas
• Extend Conservation Area to parts of North Road
• Ensure that any development, even conversions, have adequate off-road parking.
• Better cycling routes connecting Southwold and Reydon and within the town (an infrastructure concern)
• Better public transport and broadband (an infrastructure concern)
• Better management of parking and traffic (an infrastructure concern)
St John's Hall Farms
Bidwells (John Long)

Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1382

Comment

a) St John's Hall Farms' Vision for Waveney in 2036 is that it should be an economically prosperous place, with opportunities for businesses to thrive and grow, supported by key infrastructure such as appropriate numbers and types of housing, transport, education and communication networks. Each of its main towns should operate as far as possible, as self-sustaining communities, but acknowledge that jobs may not always be in the same town; and people will always have to travel to access certain types of jobs and job markets, and other services and facilities such as health, leisure and further education. This is the current situation in the Districts main town Lowestoft where residents there commute to other towns and surrounding districts for work and other activities.

The key priorities that need to be addressed are:
- Providing opportunities for job growth;
- Access to new housing;
- High attaining education establishments; and
- Ensuring infrastructure keep pace with job and housing growth.

b) St John's Hall Farms' Vision for Bungay is that it will, as far as possible, be a selfsustaining town, acknowledging that it will not provide all the jobs, facilities and services for residents but will have: a range of job opportunities; top rated education facilities; first class health and social services facilities; a thriving town centre and other retail facilities such as medium scale supermarkets to serve Bungay and its rural hinterland; good quality transport links with high quality bus services. Importantly, it will provide a range of house types and tenures to meet local needs.
Terry McDonald

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 96

Comment Lowestoft needs to look outwards and attract investment. We need to become a destination town. Attract a younger population with higher aspirations from other parts of the UK and Europe. Improved transport links are key - Third Crossing, A12 Dualing and by-passing some villages to Ipswich, Improved road and rail links to Norwich, better links with Europe either direct, through Norwich, in partnership with Great Yarmouth, or via Felixstowe/Harwich.

The Town Center, South Beach and Kirkly Shops along London Road South need major investment to attract leisure based outlets.

More housing is desperately needed in all parts of the UK. High priority should be given to social housing first and foremost, followed by affordable part-buy properties for young first time buyers.
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 1520

Comment Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Trustees have taken the opportunity to review the WDC New Local Plan and wish to offer the following comments and observations:

Halesworth is surrounded by open countryside with the prominent landscape feature being the Blyth River Valley. It is a very individual Market Town with a prominence of independent shops and traders. However over the last few years it has been seriously affected by a lack of investment from the upper tiers of government, National, County and District level. Underinvestment in our infrastructure, lack of support to increase our economic viability through limited job opportunities and employment creation have resulted in an imbalance of population age. Because of our location, close to Southwold, Aldeburgh and areas of outstanding local beauty, housing costs, higher than in many other small Market Towns, contributes toward a retirement area and an increased elderly population to the detriment of young families and the loss of our Middle School and Swimming Pool for example have given rise to the feeling of neglect.

We would welcome an increase in affordable housing and industrial allocation to help to redress some of these problems. However with housing and industrial development must come improved infrastructure, access to local senior schools, sports provision and health and welfare care. When wealth creators look to relocate or move into an area they look at available land for industry; housing; schools close to their location with good access and hospital and health care support. The market town of Halesworth is the greatest distance of any market town in England from a major hospital; only has a primary school, no senior school and limited housing and industry and shopping. This should be considered when allocations are made and investment given to support growth.
The Slater Family
Bidwells (John Long)

Section
Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID
2221

Comment
a) The Slater Family’ Vision for Waveney in 2036 is that it should be an economically prosperous place, with opportunities for businesses to thrive and grow, supported by key infrastructure such as appropriate numbers and types of housing, transport, education and communication networks. Each of its main towns should operate as far as possible, as self-sustaining communities, but acknowledge that jobs and other services may be further afield; and people will always have to travel to access them.

The key priorities that need to be addressed are:
- Providing opportunities for job growth;
- Access to new housing;
- High attaining education establishments; and
- Ensuring infrastructure keep pace with job and housing growth.

b) The Slater Family’s Vision for Bungay is that it will, as far as possible, be a selfsustaining town, acknowledging that it will not provide all the jobs facilities services for residents and people will need access to other job markets and places for shopping, healthcare etc; but will have: a range of job opportunities; top rated education facilities; first class health and social services facilities; a thriving town centre and other retail facilities such as medium scale supermarkets to serve Bungay and its rural hinterland; good quality transport links with high quality bus services. Importantly, it will provide a range of house types and tenures to meet local needs.
Three Saints South Elmham Parish Council Sally Chapman

Section

Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 2212

Comment

a) Protect rural character of the area. Ensure market towns continue to thrive. Provide opportunities for affordable housing and good jobs for young families. More concern for the environment and sustainability. Reduce reliance on the car. Keep health, social and leisure facilities as local as possible.
b) Protect rural, unspoilt character of the villages with scattered housing. Development (if any) to be limited and sympathetic to the environment. Improve community involvement. Ensure roads are safe. Greater protection for the environment and wildlife.
Webb Information Technology Services Ltd Tony Tibbenham

Section
Q03a) What is your vision for Waveney by 2036 and what are the key priorities that need to have been addressed by 2036? b) What are your vision and priorities for your town or village?

Comment ID 281

Comment
Wind energy and renewables shall increase work in Lowestoft. The local colleges will develop targeted courses to feed into the industry. The 3rd crossing will alleviate some of the north-south traffic problems and ease the 'north/south divide in the town. The town centre shall continue to struggle but outlying suburbs will continue to attract wealthy people intent on retiring to a lovely part of the country. The library will become a key focus for events in the town, offering space and resources for more groups. Local fishing industry will increase. More manufacturers will leave the town but smaller specialist firms will continue to operate. Kirkley ( around London Road South ) will be re-invigorated as tourism comes back to the beaches and town.
Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Alan Baguste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The best. Scenario 2. Scenario 3 is &quot;futurist&quot; and contains no usable data to support the assumptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1482

Comment We consider that Scenario 3 'High Growth Economic Projections' best represents the objectively assessed need (OAN) for growth over the forthcoming plan period.

In accordance with the NPPG, the household projections published by DCLG provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need (ID: 2a-015-20140306). However, in addition to the population trends, plan makers should also take into account employment trends and market signals. In this regard, we do not consider Scenario 1 (population trends) appropriate as employment trends and market signals will not have been fully assessed.

With regards to the level of employment growth that should be planned for, we consider that the Council should take into account planned investment in offshore wind. The NPPG states that whilst Local Authorities should not take into account hypothetical scenarios, it should consider "scenarios that could be reasonably expected to occur" (ID: 2a-003-20140306).

The area has seen significant investment in off-shore wind from both public and private sectors over the last couple of years. Planning permission for 102 off shore wind turbines (East Anglia One) was granted in February 2016 whilst an application has been submitted to the National Infrastructure Planning Committee for a further 172 turbines (East Anglia Three). SSE are also in the early stages of investigating two further wind farms (East Anglia North One and East Anglia Two) off the East Anglian coast. It is therefore considered reasonable to expect further investment in the wind farm industry in this area, and the anticipated growth should be planned for accordingly.
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1990

Comment In the event that the estimate of additional jobs in the wind farm industry are generated at the rate proposed, then option 3 has to be selected, as it is the only option which is capable of absorbing the growth. Failure to select this option coupled with the jobs growth forecast would see insufficient land allocated for housing and upward pressure on prices. In the event that the additional jobs are not generated no harm is done by over allocation – any unused sites can be carried forward to the next review. Choosing options 1 or 2 could create a situation where demand cannot be met and this could restrict opportunities for employment growth.
Section Q04  a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1526

Comment We consider that Scenario 3 'High Growth Economic Projections' best represents the objectively assessed need (OAN) for growth over the forthcoming plan period.

In accordance with the NPPG, the household projections published by DCLG provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need (ID: 2a-015-20140306). However, in addition to the population trends, plan makers should also take into account employment trends and market signals. In this regard, we do not consider Scenario 1 (population trends) appropriate as employment trends and market signals will not have been fully assessed.

In regards to the level of employment growth that should be planned for, we consider that the Council should take into account planned investment in offshore wind. The NPPG states that whilst Local Authorities should not take into account hypothetical scenarios, it should consider "scenarios that could be reasonably expected to occur" (ID: 2a-003-20140306).

The area has seen significant investment in off-shore wind from both public and private sectors over the last couple of years. Planning permission for 102 off shore wind turbines (East Anglia One) was granted in February 2016 whilst an application has been submitted to the National Infrastructure Planning Committee for a further 172 turbines (East Anglia Three). SSE are also in the early stages of investigating two further wind farms (East Anglia North One and East Anglia Two) off the East Anglian coast. It is therefore considered reasonable to expect further investment in the wind farm industry in this area, and the anticipated growth should be planned for accordingly.
**Section** Q04  

a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth?  
b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

**Comment ID** 256

**Comment**

* ONS FIGURES BASED ON PAST 5 YRS TRENDS SO LIKELY TO BE A GOOD GUIDE TO FUTURE.  
* DCLG SMALLER HOUSEHOLD POPULATION TAKE INTO ACCOUNT A KNOWN TREND  
* USING THESE FIGURES RATHER THAN HOPED FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUGGESTS ABOUT 7000 HOUSES REQUIRED.  
* WITH 630 HOUSES BUILT & A FURTHER 3151 HAVING PLANNING PREMISSION THERE SEEMS BE ENOUGH ALLOCATED HOUSING ALREADY.  
* PRESUMABLY PLAN WILL BE REVIEWED SO COULD ADD EXTRA HOUSING IF NEEDED AT A LATER POINT.  
* APPROX 150 HOUSES PER YR COMPLETED OVER LAST 3 YRS SO 300+ COMPLETIONS SEEMS TO BE VERY AMBITIOUS.  
* CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT CAN PLAN WHAT THEY WANT BUT UNLESS HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS OR DEVELOPERS CAN GET FUNDS NOTHING WILL BE BUILT.  
* PLANNING FOR EXTRA HOUSING BASED ON POSSIBLE JOBS SEEMS DUBIOUS. WILL THE JOBS ACTUALLY EVER HAPPEN? WILL THEY BE PERMANENT, FULL TIME, WELL PAID JOBS WHICH TEMPT PEOPLE TO BUY HOUSES? WILL THEY BE FOR LOCALS OR SHORT TERM SPECIALISTS BROUGHT IN FROM OUTSIDE?
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section  Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID  1537

Comment  It is recommended that the housing need of the Broads part of Waveney is explained. That is to say that the ORS study calculated an OAN for the Broads part of Waveney. This is calculated as 51 dwellings between 2012 and 2036 using the jobs led growth scenario. Perhaps emphasise that this is not additional to, but part of the Waveney OAN. I feel this link and explanation is important for both the WDC and BA Local Plans and Duty to Cooperate.
Councillor Caroline Topping

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1781

Comment Looking at Scenario for growth 2 and 3, it is obvious and necessary to increase employment and subsequently homes in Waveney not only for the viability of the district, but to encourage growth and wealth to the area.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1786

Comment The figure of 7700 new homes and 4000 new jobs may be sustainable/achievable. Scenario 2 the jobs may be but new homes could tip it over in Beccles Scenario 3 1500 of the jobs will be short term offshore related and once gone would we need such large housing increase.
CTC John Thompson

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 152

Comment a) If much of the expected population is expected to be of retirement age it should surely be based mainly on population trends. It may however not be clear cut thus needing to involve elements of the other scenarios.
b) Nothing to offer
David Winter
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1486

Comment

We consider that Scenario 3 'High Growth Economic Projections' best represents the objectively assessed need (OAN) for growth over the forthcoming plan period. 

In accordance with the NPPG, the household projections published by DCLG provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need (ID: 2a-015-20140306). However, in addition to the population trends, plan makers should also take into account employment trends and market signals. In this regard, we do not consider Scenario 1 (population trends) appropriate as employment trends and market signals will not have been fully assessed. With regards to the level of employment growth that should be planned for, we consider that the Council should take into account planned investment in offshore wind. The NPPG states that whilst Local Authorities should not take into account hypothetical scenarios, it should consider "scenarios that could be reasonably expected to occur" (ID: 2a-003-20140306). 

The area has seen significant investment in off-shore wind from both public and private sectors over the last couple of years. Planning permission for 102 off shore wind turbines (East Anglia One) was granted in February 2016 whilst an application has been submitted to the National Infrastructure Planning Committee for a further 172 turbines (East Anglia Three). SSE are also in the early stages of investigating two further wind farms (East Anglia North One and East Anglia Two) off the East Anglian coast. It is therefore considered reasonable to expect further investment in the wind farm industry in this area, and the anticipated growth should be planned for accordingly.
Section Q04  a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth?  b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 2082

Comment
The process of undertaking an OAN is clearly set out in the Framework principally in S14, S47, S152 and S159 and should be undertaken in a systematic and transparent way to ensure that the plan is based on a robust evidence base. The starting point for this assessment requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This involves the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative areas as detailed in §159 of the Framework. The Framework goes on to set out the factors that should be included in a SHMA including identifying:

"The scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:
* Meets household and population projections taking account of migration and demographic change;
* Addresses the need for all types of housing including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and
* Caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand."

Key points that are worth noting from the above are that the objective assessment should identify the full need for housing before the Council consider undertaking any process of assessing the ability to deliver this figure. In addition, §159 specifically relates to catering for both housing need and housing demand within the authority area. It is worth pointing out that any assessment of housing need and demand within a SHMA must also consider the following factors; falling household formation rates, net inward migration, the need to address the under provision of housing from the previous local plan period, the results of the Census 2011, housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing market, economic factors to ensure that the economic forecasts for an area are supported by sufficient housing to deliver
economic growth, off-setting a falling working age population by providing enough housing to ensure retiring workers can be replaced by incoming residents, addressing affordability and delivering the full need for affordable housing in an area.

The need to identify the full OAN before considering any issues with the ability of a Local Planning Authority to accommodate that level of development has been confirmed in the High Court. The implications of OAN following the High Court Judgment in Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council v (1) Gallagher Homes Limited (2) Lioncourt Homes Limited where it was considered that arriving at a housing requirement was a two stage process and that first the unconstrained OAN must be arrived at. In the judgement it was stated:

"The NPPF indeed effected a radical change. It consisted in the two-step approach which a balance. By contrast paragraph 47 required the OAN [objectively assessed need] to be made first, and to be given effect in the Local Plan save only to the extent that that would be inconsistent with other NPPF policies... The two-step approach is by no means barren or technical. It means that housing need is clearly and cleanly ascertained. And as the judge said at paragraph 94,"Here, numbers matter; because the larger the need, the more pressure will or might be applied to infringe on other inconsistent policies"

Therefore following the exercise to identify the full OAN for housing in an area,

"Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate." (NPPF S152)

This statement clearly sets out that local planning authorities should seek to deliver the full OAN and that this should be tested through the evidence base. Only where the evidence shows that this is not achievable should they then test other options to see if any significant adverse impacts could be reduced or eliminated by pursuing these options. If this is not possible then they should test if the significant adverse impacts could be mitigated and where this is not possible, where compensatory measures may be appropriate.

The final stage of the process is outlined in S14 and involves a planning judgement as to whether, following all of the stages of the process outlined
above,
"Local Plans should meet OAN, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:
* any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or
* specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted."

It is also worth noting that the final part of this sentence refers to footnote 9 of the Framework which sets out the types of policies that the Government consider to be restrictive. These include:
"sites protected under the Birds and Habitat Directive (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion."

Although this list is not exhaustive it is clear that local landscape designations, intrinsic value of the countryside, the character of areas, green gaps etc. are not specifically mentioned as constraints by the Framework.

The PPG contains guidance to support local authorities in objectively assessing and evidencing development needs for housing (both market and affordable) and economic development. This document supports and provides further guidance on the process of undertaking such assessments, in addition to what is set out in the Framework.

Waveney - Objectively Assessed Housing Need
Gladman have considered the Waveney Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Objectively Assessed Housing Need Study Preliminary Report published in April 2016, together with the comments raised above we would like to take this opportunity to comment on several aspects of the evidence base and on needs (OAN) for housing as required by the Framework and PPG.

The report identifies Waveney as a self-contained authority and identifies a preliminary OAN as 381 dwellings per annum over the period 2011-2036. This includes an uplift of 41 dwellings per annum to reflect the most recent household projections from DCLG, and takes account of potential economic increase as a result of Offshore Wind development. Whilst this provides a starting point to the assessment of housing need, there are many factors that have not been fully considered and may impact on the quality and adequacy of the evidence base. This could have severe implications for the
soundness of the evidence base and whether the Local Plan is planning for the appropriate level of housing need. In this regard, we consider that a review of the preliminary OAN be undertaken by a qualified demographer to ensure that the assumptions are fully justified.

Firstly, Gladman question the adequacy of the assumption that Waveney is a self-contained Housing Market Area (HMA). Whilst the evidence suggests that Waveney is below the 70% self containment threshold it is noted that S2.17 states that ‘The measure of total moves is larger as it does not exclude long-distance moves within the UK as the NPPG intends. The resulting containment ratios will therefore be underestimated and because the NPPG contains no definition of long distance moves, it is not possible to determine how much the under estimate is.’ The data suggests on average that Waveney is below the containment threshold by 1%. The underestimation of migrationary trends and only applying migrationary flow data for the period 2014-2015 without assessing longer term migrationary trends over a longer time period may have skewed the outcome of the self containment test.

Gladman are particularly concerned with the use of the 2012 Sub-National Population Projections (SNPP) which do not represent the most up-to-date data. The Report is correct that the 2008-based projections have the highest annual growth figure as these figures are not influenced by postrecessionary trends. However, we would question the assumption at S3.14 which states ‘It is clear that population growth set out in the 2008-based projections was an overestimate. This suggests that the 2008-based projections should be viewed as the absolute upper boundary of objectively assessed need.’ The 2008-based projections provide statistical data that provided a starting point for identifying housing needs, other factors should be considered and manipulated to determine the District’s full OAN. Accordingly, this statement implies a cap on what is meant to be an objective assessment of need, rather than assessing whether market signals adjustment may be required.

In applying economic-led population forecasts for the Suffolk local authorities, we would question why the brief was to 'constrain' the forecast to the East of England Forecasting Model total and working age populations. In determining the level of housing and economic need, it is important that these figures are not constrained so that they identify the Council’s full OAN. Only when the evidence underpinning the Local Plan identifies that this figure cannot be achieved through undertaking the stage 2 assessment should these figures be altered, and the Council has tested alternative options to see if any significant adverse impacts of development could be reduced or eliminated by pursuing alternative growth options.
The provision of affordable housing is a key priority that the Council should seek to achieve through its emerging Local Plan. However, the only way to improve affordability is to provide housing. If the evidence base suggests that a certain level of affordable housing is required and the Council is not seeking to address this through its emerging Local Plan, then the affordability gap will only continue to worsen.

Evidence identified in the report regarding the affordability of the District identifies that Waveney has seen large fluctuations in the housing market, and across all areas, affordability has worsened over the last 16 years and increased by 66%, more than the national average. Despite the clear problems of affordability in the district, the report makes no upward adjustment to address this worsening trend. The PPG [PPG Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 2a-020-20140306] is clear that where an upward adjustment is required, plan makers should set this adjustment at a level that is reasonable. The more significant the affordability constraints as reflected in rising prices and rents, and worsening affordability ratio, and the stronger other indications of high demand, the larger the additional supply response should be.

The PPG makes clear that the total amount of affordable housing that is required should be considered in the context of its likely delivery as a proportion of mixed market and affordable housing developments, given the probable percentage of affordable housing to be delivered by market housing led developments an increase in the total housing figures included in the Local Plan should be considered where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes [Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Chapter PPG: Reference ID 2a-09-20140306]. It is therefore clear that where adverse market signals are apparent then there is an absolute and clear direction that an upward adjustment to the housing numbers is required.

The preliminary report does not take account of the need to apply an upward adjustment to the housing numbers to address the imbalance of housing affordability in the district. The Local Plan Expert Group (LPEG) report to DCLG identifies a number of significant changes to the planning system in England. Whilst it is acknowledged that the LPEG report is not yet national policy, and has only recently been subject to a period of public consultation, it does clearly demonstrate a strengthening of thought and universal approach with regards to how market signals adjustment should be applied. Although this is a crude approach, applying the LPEG methodology would suggest a minimum uplift to address the district’s affordable housing needs should be applied in the region of 10%. However, upward adjustments relating to affordability will be dependent on the
particular circumstances of the local area and could point to a higher percentage when established through a Framework and PPG compliant OAN. Gladman take this opportunity to make the Council aware of the Canterbury Local Plan examination, where an Inspector applied a 20% uplift for market signals in line with the evidence prepared for the Council by NLP. In light of the above, it is recommended that the OAN evidence be referred to a qualified demographer to assess the reasoning of the Council’s assumptions and to ensure that the OAN is correctly identified in order to inform the basis of the housing target that is to be considered through the preparation of the Local Plan. The housing scenarios currently being consulted upon can therefore not be considered to be based on appropriate evidence at this time as the evidence will need to be revisited in order to establish a Framework/PPG compliant assessment of housing.
Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming

Section Q04  a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 2083

Comment Context

This section of the representation is made in response to the options currently being considered by the Council. Gladman have reviewed the consultation documents and have concerns regarding a number of options that are currently being considered through the emerging Local Plan that the Council are seeking to take forward from the adopted Core Strategy. It is suggested that the Waveney Local Plan will cover the period 2011 - 2036. In this regard, it is important that the plan period is aligned with the evidence base to ensure that the plan is able to deliver the housing need of this period. It may be more suitable if this period was adjusted based on the recent 2014 SNPP projections and instead cover the period 2016 - 2036.

How much Growth?

The Council is currently considering three scenarios to meet its housing needs. These are:

* Scenario 1: 7,700 new homes 4,000 new jobs (demographic-led projections).
* Scenario 2: 8,500 new homes 4,000 new jobs (economic-led projections).
* Scenario 3: 9,525 new homes 5,500 new jobs (High growth economic-led projections).

The consultation document states 'We need to first work out which of the scenarios best represents this 'objectively assessed need' and then whether to set a target which is higher or lower than the need'. This approach is simply incorrect and inherently flawed as demonstrated in the Solihull judgment [Gallagher Homes Ltd and Lioncourt Homes Ltd vs Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283]. The High Court judgment makes clear that identifying OAN is derived through a two-stage process and that the first stage that must be arrived at is the unconstrained figure. Gladman are concerned that the evidence supporting each of the three scenarios does not represent Waveney's full housing needs as illustrated in section 3.2 of these representations. The Council should not attach any weight to these figures until a comprehensive assessment of the housing needs of the area are undertaken as this could potentially point to a significantly higher level of need that the Council will not be addressing.
In response to scenarios 1 and 2, there appears to be a mismatch between the projections and level of housing need. Both scenarios aim to deliver 4,000 new jobs in the district yet plan for different levels of housing provision. If the Council is not seeking to align its housing and economic need then this will result in a mismatch between the levels of housing proposed and will likely have implications for the progression of the Plan.
Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 2093

Comment In order to meet the tests of soundness contained at paragraph 182 of the Framework, the emerging Waveney Local Plan must be found to be positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy. Having reviewed the Issues and Options consultation documents, Gladman are concerned that the housing targets currently being considered are not based on a full understanding of the district’s full objectively assessed needs. The Council should delay the progression of the Plan until it has a clear idea of what the housing needs for the district are by developing an unconstrained housing needs figure which properly follows the guidance set out in PPG and takes into account the need for market signals uplift. Once the Council has identified its full OAN, only then can careful consideration be given to the spatial strategy to inform the basis of spatial distribution and levels of growth that will need to be delivered across the district. All sustainable settlements will have a pivotal role in delivery the Council’s full housing and economic needs. The Council has made a positive start into the consideration of these issues, but substantial further work is still required if the plan is to progress through the relevant stages of plan preparation. Gladman therefore submit that in order for the plan to progress, the Council needs to undertake substantial further evidence base work with active consideration to the need to update key elements of the supporting evidence base. We therefore reserve the right to comment on these changes as and when new evidence and a draft version of the emerging Local Plan becomes available for consultation. We trust that these comments have been constructive and would welcome the opportunity to discuss any of the issues raised with the Council.
Graham and Sue Bergin

Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 357

Comment a) Scenario 1. Even this seems to overstate the need for new housing. We keep hearing that we need new housing in order to make homes more affordable. House prices will remain high regardless. It is absurd to spoil an area of relative tranquility for an unproven theory. The projected number of new jobs looks an optimistic finger in the air.
b) We would suggest a much reduced scale of development in Waveney, e.g. 2500 new homes.
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1340

Comment It is suggested that the High Economic Growth Projections scenario (381 houses per year and 5500 new jobs) is the most appropriate for the Local Plan to consider, given that the growth associated with the expansion in the offshore industry seems likely to occur.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         | Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate? | a) Scenario 1  
b) No |

| Comment ID | 1698 |
| Comment    | a) Scenario 1  
b) No |
J E Simmons

Section

Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1375

Comment

Background

1. Growth targets under the existing framework (2001 - 2021) allowed for 5,800 new homes and 5,000 new jobs.
2. The new scenarios are based in the timescale 2011 -36.
3. Although there are no figures to indicate the number of new jobs created, during the period 2011 -15, 632 new homes were built, planning permission had been granted for a further 3,151 to be built and 633 had outline planning permission.
4. Given that Waveney's housing requirement in 2036 varies across the three Scenarios (61,625, 62,425 and 63,450 respectively), viewed against the 2015 settlement figure of 55,190, indicates a shortfall of between 10.45% (6,435) and 13.01% ( 8,260). However, to meet the overall shortfall equates to the provision of, on average, 335 houses per annum.
5. In the light of the number of new build houses achieved in the 4 year period 2011/15 (158 per annum) this requirement will present a considerable challenge.
6. Based on the forecast figures, all three Scenarios indicate that the population growth will be in the over 65 age bracket. With the exception of Scenario 3, which projects a minimal decrease in the working age population, both Scenarios 1 and 2 predict a rather less favourable position.
7. Common factors to all three Scenarios are the provision of: an effective communications infrastructure both to and within the district.
   The proposed 'third crossing' may ease the situation in Lowestoft but will not improve links to other parts of the country; appropriate medical, social and care facilities appropriate to meet the needs of the ever increasing ageing population and against the current and future uncertain economic climate both nationally and locally, a realistic plan to attract investment into the area resulting in the provision a wide range of employment prospects.

In the light of the above, it is concluded that Scenario 2 "Economic Projections " best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth.
John Bumpus

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 576

Comment Scenario 2 seems the most appropriate to use. There will be some employment growth, but unless the model used is attuned to Waveney's remoteness and other problems it is unlikely to be very accurate. Scenario 3 might over emphasise the growth needed as the highest level of turbine 'boost' will surely be temporary during construction.
Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1519

Comment Regarding the number of new jobs likely to be created it is important to take into account that many production processes are becoming increasingly automated and in some instances robots are being utilised, also the amount of business being done on line is likely to continue increasing, and also because of financial implications more employees will need to extend their working life. Taking the above into account it is likely that the number of new jobs will be closer to 4000 than 5500.
John Eade

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 511

Comment All scenarios are somewhat depressing. The need for more jobs is obvious, but given that the main problem is one of unemployment in the Lowestoft area, the provision of further housing will only serve to attract people who are not looking for work.

The least harmful scenario is number 1.
Keith Winter  
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section  Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID  1408

Comment  We consider that Scenario 3 'High Growth Economic Projections' best represents the objectively assessed need (OAN) for growth over the forthcoming plan period. In accordance with the NPPG, the household projections published by DCLG provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need (ID: 2a-015-20140306). However, in addition to the population trends, plan makers should also take into account employment trends and market signals. In this regard, we do not consider Scenario 1 (population trends) appropriate as employment trends and market signals will not have been fully assessed. With regards to the level of employment growth that should be planned for, we consider that the Council should take into account planned investment in offshore wind. The NPPG states that whilst Local Authorities should not take into account hypothetical scenarios, it should consider "scenarios that could be reasonably expected to occur" (ID: 2a-003-20140306).

The area has seen significant investment in off-shore wind from both public and private sectors over the last couple of years. Planning permission for 102 off shore wind turbines (East Anglia One) was granted in February 2016 whilst an application has been submitted to the National Infrastructure Planning Committee for a further 172 turbines (East Anglia Three). SSE are also in the early stages of investigating two further wind farms (East Anglia North One and East Anglia Two) off the East Anglian coast. It is therefore considered reasonable to expect further investment in the wind farm industry in this area, and the anticipated growth should be planned for accordingly.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section  Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID  1800

Comment  Scenario 2 - household growth linked to economic growth in the area.
Kevin Kinsella

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 2214

Comment In short, our preference would be Scenario 1, Option 1.
**Larkfleet Homes**

**Seth Williams**

**Section**

Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

**Comment ID** 2146

**Comment**

* The level of housing growth which the Plan seeks to provide for should be significantly higher than the proposed options in order to support economic growth, address issues of previous undersupply and to increase choice, availability and affordability of housing.

* The Council should make more information available as to how their preliminary assessment of OAN has been arrived at and consider the issues highlighted in SPRU’s June 2016 report on the suitability of the preliminary assessment.

DLP Planning's Strategic Planning Research Unit (SPRU) has previously undertaken its own review of the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing in Waveney. A copy of this Report has previously been provided to the Council and forms part of this submission together with a more recent review and update.

This assessment found that the OAN for Waveney from 2011 to 2036 should be a minimum of 743 dwellings per annum - or 18,575 dwellings over the proposed plan period. This work has since been updated by SPRU following the publication of the latest Sub-National Population Projections on 25 May 2016 resulting in a revised OAN of approximately 606 dwellings per annum to 2036 – 15,150 over the plan period. It should be noted that this does not model in any uplift to take into account past rates of under supply of housing or low household formation rates during years of recession.

The accompanying document prepared by SPRU to support this submission outlines our reservations with the assumptions and methodology used by the Council in preparing the preliminary housing needs assessment. These can be summarised as follows:

* There is strong evidence to support a wider housing market area (HMA) which contains both Waveney and Great Yarmouth districts.

* The migration and travel to work links between Waveney and Great Yarmouth are strong and support the use of a single 'Gold Standard' HMA

* The ambitions for the New Anglia LEP are only likely to strengthen the links and therefore the case for a combined HMA.
* There has been no allowance made for vacant or second homes in the household projections calculation

* The 2012 sub-national population projections (SNPP) on which household projections were based are now out of date following the publication of the 2014-based SNPP in May 2016

* Neither of the alternative population forecast scenario applied by the Council runs to 2036 which is the full period for the Local Plan

* In the Cambridge Research Group (CRG) Economy-Led Population forecast scenario, the forecast population shows a decrease in working age population despite being economy led with no explanation for how economic growth can be supported by a decreasing population

* In the Waveney Offshore Economic Scenario, no breakdown of population by working age group is provided so it is not known how economic growth will be supported

* It is not clear if implications of Unattributable Population Change (UPC) has been taken into consideration

* The 2012 SNPP uses migration trends from the previous 5 years (2007 to 2012), which are trends experienced in a recessionary period and the Council have not made appropriate adjustments to take into consideration migration levels in more prosperous periods

* There are alternative approaches to be taken in modelling of future economic activity rates which could alter housing needs

* The 2012 SNPP assume that the present situation of more under 35's staying at home and a greater number of unrelated adults living together (shared housing) will continue but formation rates which inappropriately models model forward the negative impact of undersupply and the recession on household formation rates

* There is evidence to support an uplift to OAN in response to market signals of between 11 and 28% which has not been applied

SPRU's assessment of the Council's OAN Report concludes that it has several failings and needs to present the full forecasting for the various OAN scenarios to better understand the changes to demographics, migration and employment. In particular, this is required better to understand the implications of the two alternatives, as there is a 'misalignment' between aiming for economic growth, but assuming an overall reduction in persons of a working age. It also needs updating in light of the 2014-based SNPP, to make an allowance for second and vacant homes within the calculations, and to include an uplift in response to market signals.

The OAN identified by SPRU in their February 2016 Report, and updated to have regard to the 2014-based SNPP in their June 2016 Report, is therefore
considered to provide a more robust basis for identifying the OAN for the District.
Furthermore, SPRU’s assessment sets out the case for an uplift to the OAN in order to address previous under delivery in the District, which would have impacted both on household formation and migration. The evidence suggests that there should be a positive response to address affordability and ensure that the situation continues to improve.

Files attached:
Report on the Objectively Assessed Need for Housing of Waveney District Council
Review of the Objectively Assessed Need for Housing of Waveney District Council and Spatial Strategy of the emerging Waveney Local Plan
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1060

Comment Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the national planning policy for boosting the supply of housing. It is required for local planning authorities to use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed need (OAN) for market and affordable housing in the housing market area.
The Council have presented three scenarios for the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth: scenario 1 - population trends; scenario 2 - economic projections; and scenario 3 - high growth economic projections. Scenario 3 best represents the OAN as it is necessary for the OAN to be based upon economic projections rather than population trends in order to realistically plan for future growth and ensure the necessary amount of housing is delivered to accommodate jobs growth. The NPPF (paragraph 17) requires planning to 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development'. Whereas scenarios 1 and 2 are more restrictive in terms of jobs and housing growth, scenario 3 presents the best opportunity to drive development and encourage growth across the District.
The Council have published the 'Waveney Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Objectively Assessed Need Study' (April 2016) as part of the Evidence Base to the emerging New Local Plan. Paragraph 7.12 of the Study states that the OAN has been preliminarily assessed as 381 per annum (Scenario 3) to take account of the results of the Offshore Wind employment scenario and this is supported.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor  
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section  
Q04  
a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth?  
b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID  
1234

Comment  
Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the national planning policy for boosting the supply of housing. It is required for local planning authorities to use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed need (OAN) for market and affordable housing in the housing market area.  
The Council have presented three scenarios for the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth: scenario 1 - population trends; scenario 2 - economic projections; and scenario 3 - high growth economic projections. Scenario 3 best represents the OAN as it is necessary for the OAN to be based upon economic projections rather than population trends in order to realistically plan for future growth and ensure the necessary amount of housing is delivered to accommodate jobs growth. The NPPF (paragraph 17) requires planning to 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development'. Whereas scenarios 1 and 2 are more restrictive in terms of jobs and housing growth, scenario 3 presents the best opportunity to drive development and encourage growth across the District.  
The Council have published the 'Waveney Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Objectively Assessed Need Study' (April 2016) as part of the Evidence Base to the emerging New Local Plan. Paragraph 7.12 of the Study states that the OAN has been preliminarily assessed as 381 per annum (Scenario 3) to take account of the results of the Offshore Wind employment scenario and this is supported.
Lowestoft & Waveney Chamber of Commerce Linda Thornton

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 2232

Comment We believe that Scenario 3 'High Growth Economic Projections' most accurately reflects Waveney District's ambition and capacity for growth although the employment projections should be subject to robust examination so that the housing numbers are driven by local economic growth rather than commuter demands.
Margaret Dinn

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1436

Comment I would like to signal my support for Scenario 1, Option 1 of the options contained in the new Waveney Local Plan document.
Section Q04  a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 881

Comment From reading the background documents to this survey, I have the impression that significant doubt exists as to the appropriate modelling forecast. The population forecast based on ONS data is objective. I think it is premature to accept the highest modelling forecast.
McGregor

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 986

Comment In my view scenario 1 is the most likely. ONS figures are based on lots of data and interpreted neutrally. The jobs predicted in the other two is over optimistic.
Jen Berry

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 241

Comment We don’t need more houses! We should not allow 2nd homes which are almost empty almost all the time! There are hundreds of 2nd (empty) homes - let's get civilized.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 650

Comment Scenario 3 sounds the most realistic.
Natural England

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 2199

Comment Growth options and recreational disturbance
While we do not have specific comments on the merits or otherwise of the 3 growth options, we do have a general concern about an increased population leading to increased recreational disturbance to designated sites. Residential developments within 8km driving distance or c.1.5 Km walking distance from designated sites have been shown to attract significant recreational pressure, particularly regular dog walking. It is also likely that an overall increase in population will result in increased recreational impact on sites further afield, including into neighbouring districts.

This is an issue which has been explored in neighbouring local authorities. We understand that the Norfolk local authorities are currently preparing a report on this issue, and there are a number of local studies from Suffolk which would provide useful background. We would be happy to advise on this issue as plans develop, and it is likely that a Habitats Regulations Assessment will be required in due course. Mitigation approaches which have been adopted elsewhere include the provision of a new country park (to attract general recreation away from designated sites), the provision of green infrastructure within developments (to provide convenient local recreational dog walking facilities), and setting up wardening, monitoring and visitor management schemes for designated sites, funded by developer contributions. We note that these issues are also of relevance to the consultation questions around the provision of green space within developments.
Nicky Elliott

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 718

Comment scenario 2
Norman Castleton

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 278

Comment We need for the industries mentioned is essential but housing and maintenance of services is also due to population growth. Whether we like or not the problem of population growth outstripping the ability to cope with these increases will have to be faced sooner or later.
Norman Castleton

Section

Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID

411

Comment

How does one measure growth? Is the growth sustainable. It is time for change in using the term growth. What is meant by growth in economic terms and population terms is unsustainable. New thinking is required. Taking into account the lack of attracting high value jobs in the area then go for the low growth option as this might realistically be achieved. Counting on work in the wind power sector is placing all the eggs in one basket.
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1664

Comment Scenario 2
We do not consider Scenario 3 is achievable due to the high expectancy of growth. However, in relation to our responses to the following questions, these are based on current and known expectations, which we feel may be realised.
john norris

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 822

Comment scenario 1
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 605

Comment Scenario 1 is best because there is so much uncertainty about the impact of the EU vote. In a way I think this consultation is a bit premature.
Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 2071

Comment We consider that Scenario 3 "High Growth Economic Projections" best represents the objectively assessed need (OAN) for growth over the forthcoming plan period. When assessing the future market signals in relation to the economic potential throughout north Suffolk and into the south Norfolk area, as well as wider East Anglia, we believe that, whilst growth projections should not be based on hypothetical scenarios, planners should consider circumstances that could be reasonably expected to occur. Examples of such scenarios include; the expansion of Sizewell power station, the growth of and investment into the local offshore wind industry, the expansion and investment into the Port of Felixstowe and the development of Norwich as a regional centre for business and investment.
Simon Clack

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1647

Comment With regards to the elements contained in the Options for the new Waveney Local Plan document I would like to make the following comments and suggestions:

For the Waveney area as a whole, I believe Scenario 1 best represents the "objectively assessed need" for housing and jobs growth, and that the best option for the distribution of new development is Option 1. Lowestoft appears to have the largest amount of brown field sites available for commercial/industrial/residential development and the new jobs created by the offshore farm industry will hopefully match any job losses associated with the structural decline of the offshore oil & gas sector in the UK.
Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 70

Comment has potential housing associating from Sizewell developments been including in housing growth requirements?
The preliminary SHMA and OAN study 2016 concludes that "the Housing Market Area Objectively Assessed Need has been preliminarily assessed as 381 per annum over the period 2011 – 2036". Scenario 3 'High Growth Economic Projections' for 9525 homes at 381 per year best matches the preliminary OAN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The preliminary SHMA and OAN study 2016 concludes that &quot;the Housing Market Area Objectively Assessed Need has been preliminarily assessed as 381 per annum over the period 2011 – 2036&quot;. Scenario 3 'High Growth Economic Projections' for 9525 homes at 381 per year best matches the preliminary OAN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1278

Comment 4000 new jobs seems an ambitious target so we would favour Scenario 1 or 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**St John's Hall Farms**
Bidwells (John Long)

**Section**
Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

**Comment ID**
1379

**Comment**
The most fundamental points are related to the Growth Scenarios and the Spatial Options for Growth. It is St John’s Hall Farms' considered response that the Council should be planning for the High Economic Growth, Scenario for Waveney. The growth in new homes (9,525 homes) and jobs (5,500) should be expressed as minimum amounts to achieve, and not ceilings for develop etc. If the Local Plan plans for the High Economic Growth Scenario, it will be for more responsive and robust and capable of dealing with planning proposals as they come forward, should the High Growth Scenario occur. All the Council’s efforts, in planning, housing and economic development should be geared towards achieving this scenario, with measures put in place to help make it happen. The other scenarios lack ambition and could have the potential to stifle growth and ultimately the prosperity of the District.
**St John's Hall Farms**  
**Bidwells (John Long)**

**Section**  
Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

**Comment ID**  
1383

**Comment**  
St John's Hall Farms considers that Scenario 3 represents an appropriate growth strategy. Planning for a period up to 2036 will inevitably mean that the economy, job and housing market will have periods of uncertainty. However, by setting an ambitious high growth target, it is a clear statement of intent that Waveney is 'open for business' and a forward looking place, which welcomes investment and growth. The Council will then have a clear direction which should ensure that all of its polices align and strive towards the same goal of achieving 5,500 new jobs and sufficient new homes including affordable homes to support the growth.
St John’s Hall Farms
Bidwells (John Long)

Section Q04  a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1384

Comment St John’s Hall Farms considers that the Local Plan should plan for more than objectively assessed housing needs; that way should growth exceed expectations, the planning strategy will be robust enough to accommodate it. It is understood that the consultation documents quoted housing numbers are not complete and do not include some/all of the Districts affordable housing need. The Local Plan will therefore need to plan for higher housing numbers than those presented in the consultation documents.
Terry McDonald

Section
Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 97

Comment
Scenario 3 is required to promote growth. It should be married with a plan to attract outside investment and make Waveney a destination for young aspirational families. While forecasts indicate most growth in over 65, we should be aiming to attract a younger population to build and grow the district.
The Slater Family
Bidwells (John Long)

Section
Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID
2222

Comment
The Slater Family considers that Scenario 3 represents an appropriate growth strategy. By setting an ambitious high growth target, it is a clear statement of intent that Waveney is 'open for business', which welcomes investment and growth. The Council will need a clear direction and ensure that all of its polices align and pull towards the same goal of achieving 5,500 new jobs and sufficient new homes including affordable homes to support the growth, and meet existing and future housing needs. The Local Plan will provide the necessary direction.

In terms of the consultation questions, the most fundamental points are related to the Growth Scenarios and the Spatial Options for Growth. The Slater Family consider that the Council should be planning for the High Economic Growth, Scenario for Waveney. The growth in new homes (9,525 homes) and jobs (5,500) should be expressed as minimum amounts to achieve.

The High Economic Growth Scenario is more responsive and robust and would ensure that the Local Plan is capable of dealing with planning proposals as they come forward, in the event that the High Growth Scenario occurs.

All the Council’s efforts, in planning, housing and economic development should be geared towards achieving this High Growth scenario, with measures put in place to help make it happen. The other scenarios lack ambition and could have the potential to stifle growth and ultimately the prosperity of the District.
Tim Meadows
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1411

Comment We consider that Scenario 3 'High Growth Economic Projections' best represents the objectively assessed need (OAN) for growth over the forthcoming plan period.

In accordance with the NPPG, the household projections published by DCLG provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need (ID: 2a-015-20140306). However, in addition to the population trends, plan makers should also take into account employment trends and market signals. In this regard, we do not consider Scenario 1 (population trends) appropriate as employment trends and market signals will not have been fully assessed.

With regards to the level of employment growth that should be planned for, we consider that the Council should take into account planned investment in offshore wind. The NPPG states that whilst Local Authorities should not take into account hypothetical scenarios, it should consider "scenarios that could be reasonably expected to occur" (ID: 2a-003-20140306).

The area has seen significant investment in off-shore wind from both public and private sectors over the last couple of years. Planning permission for 102 off shore wind turbines (East Anglia One) was granted in February 2016 whilst an application has been submitted to the National Infrastructure Planning Committee for a further 172 turbines (East Anglia Three). SSE are also in the early stages of investigating two further wind farms (East Anglia North One and East Anglia Two) off the East Anglian coast. It is therefore considered reasonable to expect further investment in the wind farm industry in this area, and the anticipated growth should be planned for accordingly.
Section Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID 1396

Comment We consider that Scenario 3 'High Growth Economic Projections' best represents the objectively assessed need (OAN) for growth over the forthcoming plan period.

In accordance with the NPPG, the household projections published by DCLG provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need (ID: 2a-015-20140306). However, in addition to the population trends, plan makers should also take into account employment trends and market signals. In this regard, we do not consider Scenario 1 (population trends) appropriate as employment trends and market signals will not have been fully assessed.

With regards to the level of employment growth that should be planned for, we consider that the Council should take into account planned investment in offshore wind. The NPPG states that whilst Local Authorities should not take into account hypothetical scenarios, it should consider "scenarios that could be reasonably expected to occur" (ID: 2a-003-20140306).

The area has seen significant investment in off-shore wind from both public and private sectors over the last couple of years. Planning permission for 102 off shore wind turbines (East Anglia One) was granted in February 2016 whilst an application has been submitted to the National Infrastructure Planning Committee for a further 172 turbines (East Anglia Three). SSE are also in the early stages of investigating two further wind farms (East Anglia North One and East Anglia Two) off the East Anglian coast. It is therefore considered reasonable to expect further investment in the wind farm industry in this area, and the anticipated growth should be planned for accordingly.
Webb Information Technology Services Ltd Tony Tibbenham

Section
Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID
282

Comment
scenario 3 (new jobs and new homes) works best for me.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section  Q04 a) Which scenario best represents the 'objectively assessed need' for housing and jobs growth? b) Do you have any evidence to suggest that an alternative figure may be more appropriate?

Comment ID  1439

Comment  Scenario 3 would cover all the bases and if it turns out to be an overestimate, presumably the next review can be adjusted downwards accordingly.
Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Alan Baguste

Section Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID 758

Comment If the assessment is objective it implies that only reasonable and verifiable data has been included. So there is little point in widening the brief.
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID 1991

Comment In the event that the estimate of additional jobs in the wind farm industry are generated at the rate proposed, then option 3 has to be selected, as it is the only option which is capable of absorbing the growth. Failure to select this option coupled with the jobs growth forecast would see insufficient land allocated for housing and upward pressure on prices. In the event that the additional jobs are not generated no harm is done by over allocation – any unused sites can be carried forward to the next review. Choosing options 1 or 2 could create a situation where demand cannot be met and this could restrict opportunities for employment growth.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID 1789

Comment No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>I suggest under-development initially and then re-assess. Under-development has its problems but the consequences of over-development tend to be much worse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section | Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID | 358

Comment | Much less. In any event, infrastructure needs to be upgraded BEFORE large scale development is permitted.
### Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Plan should aim to meet its OAN; the Greater Norwich authorities consider that there is no suggestion that Waveney cannot accommodate its OAN (at whichever level OAN is settled on). Neither is there any current evidence that the three Greater Norwich authorities will not be able to accommodate their own (combined) housing need as identified through the Central Norfolk Strategic Housing Market Assessment (the Greater Norwich Local Plan is at a slightly earlier stage to the Waveney Local Plan), but this will be kept under review and should the position change, the Greater Norwich authorities will engage in discussions with Waveney DC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Possibly less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID 512

Comment The development should be targeted to the issues and not be development for its own sake. The nature of the area has deteriorated in the last 30 years because of the lack or direction for development. More work opportunities should be targeted together with regeneration of current housing. If significant new housing is allowed then the essential nature of the area will be eroded further and the good elements of living or visiting the area will be lost.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID 1061

Comment It is important that the OAN is set to encourage and not restrict growth in the District.
The Adopted Core Strategy (2009) requires a minimum of 6,960 new homes to be built across the District between 2001 and 2025, equivalent to an annual requirement of 290. Housing completions in Waveney were high in the early part of the plan period, however since 2008 there has been a persistent and increasing record of under-delivery against this annual requirement, resulting in an overall shortfall against the Core Strategy target. Taking into consideration the decline in housing delivery in the District in recent years and the emerging OAN identifying a significantly increased annual requirement from 290 to 381 units per annum over the plan period, it is important that the Council plan for a high level of growth. Development should be planned for more than the OAN to account for any sites that may not come forward as intended and to ensure that the required level of housing and jobs are delivered.
Planning for a high level of development will help ensure that housing and jobs are delivered in the most sustainable locations.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section  Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID  1235

Comment  It is important that the OAN is set to encourage and not restrict growth in the District.

The Adopted Core Strategy (2009) requires a minimum of 6,960 new homes to be built across the District between 2001 and 2025, equivalent to an annual requirement of 290 new homes. Housing completions in Waveney were high in the early part of the plan period, however since 2008 there has been a persistent and increasing record of under-delivery against this annual requirement, resulting in an overall shortfall against the Core Strategy target. Taking into consideration the decline in housing delivery in the District in recent years and the emerging OAN identifying a significantly increased annual requirement from 290 to 381 units per annum over the plan period, it is important that the Council plan for a high level of growth. Development should be planned for more than the OAN to account for any sites that may not come forward as intended and to ensure that the required level of housing and jobs are delivered.

Planning for a high level of development will help ensure that housing and jobs are delivered in the most sustainable locations.
Lesley Beevor

Section Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID 776

Comment plan for less
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Waveney has lost 1000s of jobs in the past 3 decades yet housing has grown hugely more emphasis on employment should be given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section  Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID  39

Comment  It strikes me that the nature of the homes that are built is fundamental to how demand will change. If we continue to build 'executive' 3/4/5 bedroom properties, then it will continue to attract more people to the area. If we build more smaller properties, then it will allow young first time buyers to start a life together, and it will allow older residents to move to more suitable accommodation thus freeing up their existing properties. There is a need to concentrate on building properties that will benefit those that currently live in the area rather than properties that will attract even more people in, as that will just continue to fuel demand, require even more building, and price the local population out of the marketplace.
john norris

Section Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID 823

Comment less
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Somerleyton Estate Lord Somerleyton
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID 2123

Comment At this early stage in the preparation of the plan it would be prudent to aim high and plan positively. The OAN is the highest of the three growth options and a comfortable margin would be sensible. Not least to cater for the revised population statistics and economic forecasting Waveney is expecting.

Such an approach would comply with national planning policy; paragraph 157 of the NPPF states that "Local Plans should [inter alia] plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of this Framework".
Section Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID 2133

Comment At this early stage in the preparation of the plan it would be prudent to aim high and plan positively. The OAN is the highest of the three growth options and a comfortable margin would be sensible. Not least to cater for the revised population statistics and economic forecasting Waveney is expecting.

Such an approach would comply with national planning policy; paragraph 157 of the NPPF states that "Local Plans should [inter alia] plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of this Framework".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We should be planning for growth which meets the objectively assessed need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No comment on growth scenarios.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terry McDonald

Section  Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID  98

Comment  We should aim for more development were practical. Growth is desperatley needed in this region and half measures won't work.
Section Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?

Comment ID 2223

Comment The Slater Family considers that the Local Plan should plan for more than objectively assessed housing needs. That way should growth exceed expectations, the planning strategy will be robust enough to accommodate it.
Webb Information Technology Services Ltd Tony Tibbenham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q05 Should we be planning for more or less development than the objectively assessed need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Neither. Plan for what is assessed. It takes into account the only significant growth factors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID 1992

Comment It is my experience that retail assessments have continually overestimated the requirement for retail space based on assumptions about population growth and increased spending and have justified out of town shopping on this basis, to the detriment of town centres. As part of their justification, they talk about existing stores overtrading, ie where the £ per sq m "take" is in excess of the average for the sector. There is no harm in existing stores overtrading, unless it is creating undue pressure on car parking or the local environment and I would urge you to treat these figures with a degree of caution. Whilst a multiplex would be a great idea, the population spread criteria to support one is unlikely to be met, due to the location of the Lowestoft as a coastal town. Torkildsens in Sport and Leisure Management, (Routledge 2005) says that a 6-8 screen complex would typically require a catchment of 150,000 within a 20 minute drive time. Un-achievable aspirations in a plan lack credibility and should be examined carefully.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID 1082

Comment There aren't enough facilities for the existing population. There is no real infrastructure now that matches the increase in population.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID 1790

Comment Whist there is no evidence to dispute the figures we should look carefully at the use of the existing retail units and if we should be looking at a more radical answer. Currently a huge % of small retail outlets are Estate Agents, Charity shops or Banks. Even huge retail groups are struggling to survive in today’s conditions with regard to the internet, rents, wage costs etc.
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section  Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID  1342

Comment  The Greater Norwich authorities assume that the figures disclosed in the Waveney Retail and Leisure Needs Assessment 2016 are the best available and does not have any alternative evidence.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section  Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID  1700

Comment  With the increase in on-line retail and the existing vacant units the estimated retail need may be in excess of that required, but with the increase in older population affordable leisure and recreational facilities may need to grow.
John Bumpus

Section Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID 577

Comment The retail assessment needs treating with caution. The food retailing aspect is obviously linked to population, but non-food retailing needs caution as all the signs are that there are too many shops now and that the trend is likely to accelerate.

Any restaurants or cafes should be required to provide public access toilet facilities to make up for the lack of public facilities.
John Eade

Section
Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID 513

Comment The assessed need appears to assume that uncontrolled growth is allowed in other areas.
Larkfleet Homes
Seth Williams

Section Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID 2147

Comment The Council’s Retail Needs Assessment is based on the 2012-based SNPP projections. However, this has no regard to the need to plan for economic growth in the District and to support the creation of new jobs, in particular in the off-shore energy sector. As set out above and in the accompanying SPRU reports, the identified OAN for housing is significantly higher if such economic projections (and other factors) are appropriately applied and therefore it follows that the quantitative retail and leisure needs are also likely to be proportionately greater.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Haycock</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicky Elliott

Section Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID 719

Comment Not entirely. What about increased need for allotments, physical exercise outdoors, and outdoor sports facilities?
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID 40

Comment It's difficult to comment without knowing how this is to be spread around the district, but the facilities in Worlingham are sorely lacking meaning that for most items a trip into Beccles is needed. The increase in housing and population over the years has had a corresponding increase in traffic making this trip a slow one particularly at school times and Saturday mornings. The lack of good cycle paths also makes it a less than pleasant trip for those choosing that form of transport. Facilities generally in Beccles appear to be becoming overwhelmed, particularly sporting provision for all ages, and as Worlingham has no pub, let alone a restaurant, café or gym, there is nowhere within a comfortable walking distance for the existing let alone a growing population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>john norris</td>
<td>Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>retail development will be less important due to online shopping. leisure facilities need to be improved/extended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID 1006

Comment Definitely need wonderfully vibrant independent shops and restaurants in Beccles to compliment the quaint feel of the area with affordable rates. There is currently 13 charity shops in Beccles, way too many but there is enough retail space if some of these were independent shops again. The rates and high rents cripple small businesses. I know many (well to do) people from Lowestoft, who only shop and dine in Beccles as it’s such a joy. Don't shoot the golden goose. I visited Louth in Lincs recently, this would be a great model to follow..beautifully up kept heritage, independent interesting shops and great bars and nightlife. Punches well above its weight on all levels.

Cinema, really? The population is moving towards home cinema, consider this. I think the area as a whole does very well for big food supermarket outlets. How about something more niche like Wholefoods or Waitress. The area's crying out for this.

I will suggest that Beccles needs to invite an independent health club ie Banatyn, the surrounding demographic is huge
Section Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

Comment ID 606

Comment Yes. There are also a lot of horse owners in the district and I think the Council should consider zoning where horsey culture is likely to be acceptable as in certain locations it can be problematic eg leachate, no relationship to the bridleway network etc.
**Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>In Southwold and Reydon we need policies which protect the variety of the retail offer in Southwold High Street, particularly the retention of smaller units suitable for independent shops. The attractiveness of the High Street is a significant draw for the tourism on which our local economy depends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terry McDonald

**Section**

Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?

**Comment ID**

99

**Comment**

The study seems to suggest most of the right areas - restaurants, cafes, hotels, gyms, cinema. We need to look at other leisure opportunities. While Lowestoft shouldn't aim to compete with the gaudyness of Great Yarmouth or Blackpool, there is more we can do to improve our South Beach area and surrounding Kirkby shops to promote the town as a seaside destination.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web Information Technology Services Ltd Tony Tibbenham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q06 Do the figures presented above with respect to retail and leisure needs represent the 'objectively assessed need' for these uses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong> 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> I see no need for more or expanded retailers as existing stores are under-utilised. A multiplex will make existing cinemas struggle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Adam Hook

Comment ID 405

Comment
Option 4 - New Settlement.
Beccles and Worthingham does not have the facilities and public services, nor the roadways to support significant growth. Lowestoft is in need of regeneration rather than growth and with the bridges is already a pain to drive through. A new settlement is best all round - properly designed road system with infrastructure and facilities to cope but with funds to regenerate Lowestoft and get people back there spending their money. Its now worse than Yarmouth but without the novelty seaside charm.
Alan Baguste

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 759

Comment Option 1. If Lowestoft thrives then the whole district benefits. If development is scattered there will be less incentive to provide supporting amenites and services and those that are provided will be subjected to claim and counterclaim claim from the outlying centres of population.
Andrew Nainby

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 960

Comment OPTION 3 - is the fairest distribution of impact and benefits
Anonymous

Section | Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID | 151

Comment | Option 3. Most effective for whole area.
Anonymous

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 289

Comment Option 2 possibly makes the most sense. Beccles seems to be thriving currently.
Anonymous

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 312

Comment Option 1 - Lowestoft needs better jobs and professional people to help offset and transform the deprivation. The other towns and villages would change beyond recognition with excessive development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Option 1 - Plenty of available land to build on and infrastructure to support more people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 326

Comment Option 3 - Spread development even more than this option as development is weighted very heavily on Lowestoft.
Anonymous

**Section**
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

**Comment ID**
333

**Comment**
Option 3 - Future of our market towns need to be taken into account. So spreading housing through them is vital.
Anonymous

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1576

Comment Ticked option 1 – Continue to focus new growth in Lowestoft; Ticked option 4 – new settlement.
Option 4: A new settlement could be built with the infrastructure to support it, especially road links to access and ingress.
Option 2: A certain amount of development to support the proposed new employment.
<p>| Anonymous |  |
|-----------|--|---|
| <strong>Section</strong> | Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best? |  |
| <strong>Comment ID</strong> | 1622 |  |
| <strong>Comment</strong> | Option 1. Lowestoft has the opportunities for job creation to go alongside new development. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AP and AE Wolton**

**Section**  
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

**Comment ID**  
1616

**Comment**  
Option 1 Continue to focus new growth in Lowestoft.
We consider that Option 3 (spread development more evenly across market towns and rural areas) presents the best option for new development over the plan period. Whilst we acknowledge that growth of the main settlements is important, it is essential that the Council recognise that development in smaller settlements is necessary and at times more appropriate. Development in Waveney has often been limited to the main towns and service centres which has led to an uneven distribution with many smaller settlements effectively being excluded from open market development. The Taylor Review 'Living Working Countryside' (2008), which helped to inform the preparation of the NPPF, was highly critical of the approach taken to development in rural areas, noting that many rural settlements were effectively 'written off' as unsustainable for new development putting many services and facilities at risk. These villages play an integral part in the servicing the local community and it is vital provision is made for their growth over the forthcoming plan period to ensure their continued contribution to their local communities. The village of Reydon is one such village which is considered suitable of providing and supporting new housing development (please see our response to Q15 for further detail).
B A Crockford

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  228

Comment  I do not agree with the way the questions are framed. It causes less social distress when growth is organic in all towns as it has been throughout history. Rural villages are not suitable for major development but the current blanket ban is wrong. Every village should be allowed some development say 1 property per year to allow the next generation to remain.
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1993

Comment The original plan, concentrating on the regeneration of the Lake Lothing area has failed. None of the sites are under development and the principle developers in the town have shown no interest. For the most part the schemes rely on high density flatted schemes which are expensive to build and unsuited to local market conditions. A number of unresolved issues remain, such as the overall provision of access, the practicalities of flood protection and drainage and the relocation of playing fields on to land not in the same ownership. The Council pulling out of the Sanyo site has also dented confidence in the area. I remain of the view that the original approach was wrong and that much of this site could have been retained for industry, with an opportunity for a linear park and cycle route along the river frontage. Whilst this would have required public sector involvement in land acquisition it would have acted as a "pump primer" for the area. Re using the site almost exclusively for housing, removes those existing uses and creates a situation where residents commute out to South Lowestoft or Ellough for work. This is no more sustainable than residents from outlying parts of the town commuting in to the riverside to work.

Any strategy for the allocation of new housing needs to provide a range of smaller sites – say each up to around 200 units rather than a single allocation of 1000. This reduces the likely infrastructure costs for each site to a level manageable by a single developer and provides a range of locational options for purchasers- It will also serve to increase output, as there is more likely to be a spread of sales around those sites in excess of annual sales levels achievable from one large site.

The market towns should be given Allocations. The present strategy has starved them of new housing, creating upward pressure on prices.

Allocations do of course need to be commensurate with the ability of local infrastructure to cope, or be where additional infrastructure can be funded by the development or through CIL payments. Whilst it would be inappropriate for the council to be seen at this stage to support any individual site proposed by developers, with their promises of delivery, due regard should be given to sites promoted by developers, rather than land owners or speculators, as it is those sites which are most likely to provide delivery in the plan period.
We conclude that Option 3 provides the best spread of development around the district.
Barry Spall

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1337

Comment Option 4 seems the only feasible plan for future development with regard to the Beccles/Worlingham area.
Barsham and Shipmeadow Village Hall L R Hatton

Section

Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID

1555

Comment

I accept that proposals listed in the plan have not been evaluated yet, but the assemblage seems to have been made on the basis of landowner’s greed with no regard to the realities of life in rural Waveney. Both Beccles and Bungay are poorly equipped to deal with the influx of population envisaged. Health services are 20 miles away in Gorleston or Norwich. Dental practices are overloaded with a waiting time of 2 months for an appointment with the NHS. Beccles Health Centre is well managed but extremely busy. The pharmacy has long queues. Parking in Beccles is often impossible when trying to use Tesco’s carpark. This is especially the case on market day and Saturdays. Public transport is only provided at satisfactory levels during school terms. A trip to Norwich return from Shipmeadow would take all day.
Beccles Society Paul Fletcher

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1398

Comment In considering where growth should go, Beccles Society have first assessed the local situation in our vicinity.

* Southwold has the advantage of being a desirable "second home" destination with a vibrant tourism economy. The downside is that "second home" syndrome has a tendency to prevent locals (especially the younger age group) from getting a foothold on the property ladder. It also means that houses often remain empty during the winter months and this does nothing to help the local economy. Apart from Adnams/ agriculture there appears little in the way of non-tourism employment. Reydon does not have the tourism aspect although no doubt picks up tourism jobs from Southwold. However it does have a small business park.

* Bungay has Clays printers but appears to have little else in the way of substantial employment. It benefits from having specialist shops and a thriving theatre but economically its centre appears to be in decline. It is shortly to have a new museum and also has a popular indoor swimming pool often used by people from neighbouring towns. The town appears mainly to be a retirement and/or dormitory town.

* Halesworth also appears to be in economic decline but does have an industrial estate (substituting for Howard Rotavators once a substantial employer) and many car franchise outlets. It also has a thriving theatre and a leisure club. Again there appears to be little in the way of substantial employment which means that unless change is engendered Halesworth is also likely to become a retirement town and/or dormitory town.

* Beccles/Worlingham have a number of large manufacturing and a considerable number of small industrial units in relation to the size of the population. The building of the Southern Relief Road will probably increase the attractiveness for companies to consider development options for Beccles and Worlingham. They also have the advantage of proximity to Lowestoft should the expected offshore wind developments generate as much activity as forecast. Plus there is a non-Lowestoft route directly to Great Yarmouth. Both would be beneficial to future smaller offshore associated industries sited in Beccles/ Worlingham especially in view of the Enterprise Zone benefits. Deciding where companies locate is difficult to predict or control as they primarily look to what affects their profitability,
the best authorities can do is offer inducements.
Based on all the above assumptions Beccles Society's views on the options for growth are as follows:-
Option 1
It is agreed that the major development should be concentrated on Lowestoft but in such a way as not to limit the scope for providing opportunities for growth in the rest of Waveney, hence ruling out this option.
Option 2
This has the same drawbacks as Option 1 and simply spreads growth over a Lowestoft/Beccles corridor making the present Waveney imbalance more pronounced.
Option 3
Of all of the four options this offers the best opportunity to share the benefits across the market towns but provides too much growth for Beccles.
Option 4
This has similar drawbacks to Option1 and has the added disadvantage of trying to find a suitable location to site a new settlement. Beccles Society is therefore of the opinion that a fifth option would be preferable, spreading growth in the market towns but reducing growth in Beccles and rural areas below that shown in Option 3.
This new option 5 is now set out below:-
Lowestoft 60%
Beccles 12%
Halesworth 8%
Southwold 6%
Bungay 4%
Rural Areas 10%
Beccles Town Council C Boyne

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1491

Comment It was also agreed that Beccles/Worlingham should not be expected to take more than 10% of the future housing needs of Waveney at the very most due to the severe constraints on infrastructure. It was also felt that the rural areas and other market towns should take a bigger share of any new developments. In addition there was agreement for the need to re balance the entire district with development to the south, away from Lowestoft and Beccles. With the amalgamation of Waveney District Council and Suffolk Coastal almost certain, development to the south leaning towards Saxmundham with the railway at Halesworth and Darsham plus the A 12 feeding north and south seems to make sense. We should look beyond the border of Waveney District Council when looking at a 20 year plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Beccles is situated at the top of a triangle and is constrained from any expansion by the river Waveney on one side and the common/marshes on the other and has almost no available land within it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ben Blower

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 398

Comment Option 3 is the better option because it will have a less drastic effect on each location. However, this option does not provide for the even spread that should be the target. 55% of the development remains in Lowestoft where the infrastructure particularly the road system is already stretched to capacity. The option states that there will be an even spread between the market towns and the rural areas but 15% is allocated to Beccles and only 4% to Bungay, 6% to Southwold, 8% to Halesworth and 12% to rural areas. That is not even.
Benacre Estates Company Edward Vere Nicoll
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1527

Comment We consider that Option 3 (spread development more evenly across market towns and rural areas) presents the best option for new development over the plan period.
Whilst we acknowledge that growth of the main settlements is important, it is essential that the Council recognise that development in smaller settlements is necessary and at times more appropriate. We do not consider that provision for just 5% growth in rural areas is appropriate as proposed in Scenarios 1, 2 and 4. This is contrary to the NPPF which seeks to promote sustainable development in rural area by encouraging economic growth and enhancing thriving rural communities.
Development in Waveney has often been limited to the main towns and service centres which has led to an uneven distribution with many smaller settlements effectively being excluded from open market development.
The Taylor Review 'Living Working Countryside' (2008), which helped to inform the preparation of the NPPF, was highly critical of the approach taken to development in rural areas, noting that many rural settlements were effectively 'written off' as unsustainable for new development putting many services and facilities at risk. These villages play an integral part in the servicing the local community and it is vital provision is made for their growth over the forthcoming plan period to ensure their continued contribution to their local communities.
The village of Wrentham is one such village which is considered suitable of providing and supporting new housing development (please see our response to Q15 for further detail).
**brian may**

**Section**

Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

**Comment ID**

257

**Comment**

* SCENARIO 3 BEST

* POPULATION GROWTH FIGURES SUGGESTS MAIN GROWTH IS RETIREES COMING INTO AREA & PEOPLE GENERALLY LIVING LONGER

* IT IS A FAIR ASSUMPTION THAT OLDER PEOPLE ON WHOLE PREFER TO STAY WHERE THEY KNOW AND HAVE FAMILY AND FRIENDS WHICH SUGGESTS SPREADING DEVELOPMENT EVENLY OVER DISTRICT

* FROM MY EXPERIENCE RETIREES PREFER EITHER THE RURAL AREAS OR THE MARKET TOWNS SO SPREADING DEVELOPMENT MORE EVENLY WOULD ENTICE INWARD INVESTMENT FROM THIS GROUP.

* EVEN DEVELOPMENT WOULD ALSO HELP PRESERVE THE MARKET TOWNS AND SMALLER RURAL VILLAGES.

* A NEW VILLAGE WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE. IT WOULD ALTER THE FEEL OF THE AREA, ROB TRADE FROM EXISTING TOWNS, REQUIRE MASSIVE INFRASTRUCTURE BUILD WHEN SOCIETY IS STRUGGLING TO MAINTAIN WHAT IT HAS PLUS WHY LOSE FURTHER LANDSCAPE & BIODIVERSITY BY BUILDING ON A GREENFIELD SITE.
Bryony Townhill

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 949

Comment Option 1. It makes sense to develop brownfield sites within Lowestoft. It will help regenerate the town and will mean that housing is close to transport links. The area around the river could be developed to make some really nice housing and greatly improve the whole area. Another town or more houses in rural locations will only put more stress on the roads whereas Lowestoft could be a really nice place that people would want to live if it was planned well. There are also a lot of empty flats above shops, or in derelict buildings in the town which could be used for housing.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Brownfield sites. Halesworth with its access to roads and railways and infrastructure. NOT in Carlton Colville which has already had an increase in size equivalent to what is described on page 9 as a small settlement and parts of which is now flooded every time there is a heavy shower of rain due to the amount of building on permeable ground surface and the inability of the drainage systems to cope with the increased housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charles Fortt

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1216

Comment Option 1.
chris Morris

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1601

Comment Option 1 – Continue to focus new growth in Lowestoft. Availability of brownfield sites close to town centre around Lake Lothing. And proposed development area to south of Lowestoft.
Councillor Caroline Topping

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1782

Comment Option 1. Focusing most of the build in Lowestoft makes sense as this is where most of the jobs are going to be created with the 'off shore windfarm' and the less travelling from further afield the less traffic on our already crowded roads.

With regards to option 2. This would be a disaster for Beccles as the building of 2000 new homes would increase the Beccles populations by more than half of its current population again and would put horrendous pressure on our already oversubscribed high school, doctors and dentist surgeries as well as the medieval town roads and buildings. This is not to say I am opposed to building in Beccles area as I have children who will need affordable housing, (which is not currently available) and the ageing populations is in sore need of more bungalows in this area.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1791

Comment Either option 1 or 4 as Beccles is situated in the tip of a triangle and is unable to expand on two sides due to the proximity of The Broads on one side and the common on the other. The road routes into Beccles are already at breaking point and any major housing development would put an impossible burden on the existing infrastructure, roads, health, parking, shops etc. Whilst we appreciate there must be development across Waveney, Beccles town centre has nowhere to expand and therefore any major development would require the provision of suitable infrastructure to the east of the town. It may be possible to accommodate small scale development over a period of time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniela Goodall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David Burman

Section
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID
630

Comment
Option 3. The country as a housing shortage and action is required but we need to preserve the countryside and not fill it up with huge numbers of houses. Many villages can take infill sites and some scale developments that will not overwhelm the locality.
**David Winter**  
*Savills (Philip Rankin)*

**Section**  
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

**Comment ID**  
1487

**Comment**

We consider that Option 3 (spread development more evenly across market towns and rural areas) presents the best option for new development over the plan period. Whilst we acknowledge that growth of the main settlements is important, it is essential that the Council recognise that development in smaller settlements is necessary and at times more appropriate. In order to facilitate a sustainable economic growth structure in the Waveney District, residential developments should be spread throughout the District in order to ensure that local communities receive the resulting benefits of associated community facility and infrastructure improvements. It is also imperative that market towns and similarly sized conurbations continue to attract new inhabitants from a wide ranging demographic, and an effective method of achieving this goal is via sustainable and proportional residential development throughout the district. When considering Halesworth in relation to the wider development strategy, the town offers an opportunity to sustainably deliver a large amount of housing in an area where the housing need is considerable.
Debbie Read

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 337

Comment Option 3 - Why does everything need to be centered in Lowestoft. Other areas will then suffer from a lack of investment or interest from WDC as is already evident.
Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1320

Comment I think that the plan to continue Lowestoft focus is the best option. It has the most adequate facilities, infrastructure and available immediate room for further growth.
Diane Scott

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 754

Comment Concentrating growth in the Lowestoft area is preferable as that is where most jobs are. Any new housing development should be located between Lowestoft and Gt. Yarmouth as this will minimise traffic congestion and give greatest access to job. Locating development between Beccles and Lowestoft is less preferable as this will create traffic congestion, impact more on the environment and give less access to jobs. The market towns cannot absorb more traffic and pressure on public services such as schools and housing. There are less jobs there too.
Diane Scott

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 755

Comment Option 4 is preferable as it will cause less traffic congestion and give greatest access to jobs and put less pressure on public services on health and housing in market towns. Growth should be located between Lowestoft and Yarmouth for these reasons.
Diane Scott

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 756

Comment Growth for the market towns as shown in option 3 is unacceptable. It would cause too much traffic congestions and put too much pressure on public services such as health as schools. In Bungay it would be intrusive into the environment, expensive to build and lose valuable agricultural land. Growth should be centered on Lowestoft where jobs are located and sited between Lowestoft and Yarmouth.
Didy Ward

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 116

Comment Option 3 is the fairest. The market towns need to grow or they risk becoming either dormitory towns or areas of deprivation. Our region offers much to visitors, both local (where we visit each other's towns and villages) and nationally. To develop one or two regions at the expense of others risks limiting the attractiveness of the market towns to visitors and jeopardising the whole region as a visitor destination. Similarly families need jobs, housing, education in the region. Without growth in the market town the exodus of the young out of the region will only increase.
Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1054

Comment the best option for the distribution of new development is option 4 new settlement.
G Golding

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 91

Comment Option 2, if Beccles is to be developed then not all leisure facilities should be centred in Lowestoft they should be shared with Beccles
Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1590

Comment Option 1 – You have stated that significant growth in economy is forecast off the Lowestoft coast so I would propose that housing and infrastructure is focussed in Lowestoft to support this rather than interfere with other towns in the area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2084

Comment In the first instance the Council should identify what the OAN for the district is before any decision is made on the spatial approach. The housing figures that the Council is currently consulting upon are yet to be finalised and subject to additional work. Gladman therefore reiterate the importance of finalising this evidence base work before the Council proceed on a housing figure which may not fulfil its housing needs and meet its responsibility under the DtC.

Notwithstanding this, in terms of the proposed spatial distribution, the current options being considered explore a series of options which consider the various potential strategies. Gladman would be supportive of delivering growth towards principle settlements within the district, especially those considered to be sustainable with access to a variety services and facilities. This should however not be at the expense of allowing proportionate growth opportunities from coming forward in lower order settlements.

Whilst each scenario only provides an indicative percentage of the level of development expected to be delivered, it does not suggest what form of development is likely to take place. Therefore, we take this opportunity to highlight that an approach which targets significant development towards one location in the form of Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) following the historical approach to growth towards Lowestoft will only allow the Council to deliver its medium to long term housing needs and will not address the affordability pressures that are currently being experienced across the district. Whilst the delivery of SUEs and/or a new settlement will allow the Council to deliver significant housing numbers to meet its housing needs, in addition to delivering new and/or significant improvements to local infrastructure assets to serve the proposed development, the delivery of such schemes can often be delayed as a result of extensive master planning, negotiations between various landowners, long lead in times and may not deliver at the expected rate or scale envisaged. If either of these options are taken forward, the Council should avoid applying unrealistic delivery assumptions as a means of absorbing significant housing numbers that will consequently reduce the need for housing in other sustainable locations across the district. An approach that would apply unrealistic and overly ambitious delivery assumptions is not sound and can have serious effects.
implications for future housing delivery.

In principle, Gladman are supportive of the Council's consideration of a new settlement to deliver up to 2,000 dwellings. As already discussed, caution should however be applied in establishing the expected build out rates and infrastructure requirements as the delivery of such a site will only deliver the district's longer term housing needs and will likely continue following the end of the plan period. This will leave no room for slippage and should this happen will leave the Council in a position were it will be unable to react to market changes i.e. where an undersupply of housing occurs.

In allocating sites, the Council should be mindful that to maximise housing supply the widest possible range of sites by size and market location are required, so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable housing land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increasing housing supply is the number of sales outlets. Whilst the delivery of Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) may have multiple outlets, in general increasing the number of sales outlets available means increasing the number of housing sites. So for any given time period, all else been equal, overall the sales and build out rates will be faster from 20 sites of 50 units than 10 sites of 100 or 1 site of 1,000. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand. In summary, a variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land, which in turn will assist the Council in maintaining a flexible and responsive supply of housing land and increased housing delivery.
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 359

Comment Option 1. As an existing large community Lowestoft is better placed to absorb the extra residents. These extra residents will help to boost local businesses and generally to regenerate the town. The market towns do not have the infrastructure to absorb the extra residents and are thriving as is.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1531

Comment HTC IS in favour of option 3 as this spreads the development evenly across the market towns. Option 4 not acceptable as it would be detrimental to the market towns and have an adverse effect.

The market town of Halesworth serves a number of local parishes as well as its own residents. There is a wide range of independent shops. Halesworth also has a much used library and an Arts Centre, the Cut.

A quarter of the population is over 65. This has implications for the provision of health care and leisure activities to help keep the population fit and active. The loss of the town swimming pool was a blow to the town. It is hoped that there will be a sports development on the Middle School and Dairy Hill sites in next few years.

However, in order that Halesworth does not become a 'retirement town' considerable investment is needed in the town to attract industry and a younger demographic.

The Local Plan has some interesting suggestions, some of which will help with this aspiration. But, some of the proposals are unsustainable due to the lack of infrastructure such as suitable roads, school places, inadequate and elderly sewage systems and water management schemes to prevent flooding.

Halesworth Town Council is happy to engage in discussion with Waveney about any proposals in this consultation.
Hilary Baker

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 627

Comment I think option 1 is the best. It is important to use brownfield sites before greenfield sites. Lowestoft already has the infrastructure to support new development. It is important to maintain aspects of country living which are enjoyed by people wherever they live. People need green spaces to enjoy walking, exercising their dogs, birdwatching, cycling, horseriding etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ian King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ingrid North

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  1018

Comment  Not that long ago villages supported several businesses and everyone used them. The car has put an end to this and village businesses struggle to survive. It would make no difference to build more homes, villages are commuter ghettos and the people that live in them shop and work in the towns. It would be far better to develop the designated sites in and around Lowestoft, it has the infrastructure, Jobs, Schools, Doctors, shops, recreational facilities and Public transport, which can support and sustain development and hopefully help to regenerate the Town.
Irene Thomas

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 332

Comment My concerns are about
1. Protecting greenfield sites
2. Using brownfield sites wherever applicable (although developers find these more expensive therefore prefer greenfield sites)
3. Housing needs to be affordable and meet the needs of local people. Not just a few token cheaper houses on an expensive development (i.e. Roman Way, Halesworth)
4. Flood plain is a concern.
5. Infrastructure - schools, local shops, transport parking, medical services for buildings at the extreme ends of town. Sewage and mains services are vital.
6. Proposal could increase housing stock in Halesworth by 30% - changing the character of the town completely.
J E Simmons

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1376

Comment In response to the question, 'Where is new growth best located'
In support of Scenario 2, Option 2 (Promote significant growth in Beccles and Worlingham) would appear the preferred solution.
Julian Munson

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1164

Comment Option 4 (new settlement) is potentially a better option as would allow the opportunity for appropriate planning and infrastructure investment. Location would need to be close to main transport routes and public transport with appropriate provision of local services e.g. education, health, and community based.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>James Harvey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
James Toole

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 189

Comment Option 2. In recent years too much of all growth and facilities have been in Lowestoft. Not everyone wants to experience the all too frequent congestion every time you need to move about. Plus Lowestoft is seen as a down market area.
James Toole

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 200

Comment I can only speak for the area I live (Beccles), it seems many areas of Waveney other than Lowestoft have not received the investment they deserve. Lowestoft will always be a choice for primary shopping, although traders in Beccles should be allowed to prosper by the increase in footfall an enlarged town would bring. We in Beccles can only look at the fine cycleways and transport structure in Lowestoft and be jealous. It’s about time Waveney District lived up to the name, Waveney is not just Lowestoft. Otherwise you’re not doing a bad job as a District Council. Well done.
Jeffrey Harris

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 302

Comment I would opt for option 3 or 4. Living in the centre of Beccles obviously I have a interest. Wherever the houses are built around Beccles or Worlingham, the dwellers will come into Beccles to shop causing even worse congestion than there is now. Currently the parking facilities are inadequate and there is no space centrally to expand. I think a fresh start is needed with modern town planning applied ie a new settlement rather than adding to the current woes of small towns. A fresh modern approach to access, neighbourhood planning, mixed residential, and proper facilities re schools, medical centre and shops.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jenny Riley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Bumpus

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 578

Comment Options 1 or 4 are clearly the only ones where an adequate infrastructure is likely to be put in place to support growth. Option 1, though, clearly overstates the growth potential of Beccles and it should be reduced and Lowestoft's proportion increased. Beccles is already overstretched in terms of its infrastructure and its physical location makes expansion of its central facilities very difficult. If it is to expand further, this expansion should be tied to major road improvements to the links with Lowestoft and Norwich, as any new residents are unlikely to find employment in Beccles. This alone calls into question the sustainability of developments outside of Lowestoft.

For both Options 1 and 4, it seems that there are two major factors pointing to any development being to the north of Lake Lothing. Until there is a firm bankable commitment to build the third crossing it would be irresponsible to add to Lowestoft’s problems with further development to the south. Secondly, as a great deal of the population increase is expected to be over 65's it is sensible to put them and any developments with easy reach of the major health facilities in Norfolk. This would indicate a new settlement to the north of Lowestoft on the A12. The new settlement should be conditional on infrastructure being provided in the same timescale.
Joanna Barfield

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 237

Comment Also don't like option 4 - new site taking over more of countryside.
John and Barbara Carter

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1511

Comment We think Option 2 is preferred because
a) We do not think it is realistic for Lowestoft to grow more than 60%
b) This Option provides sensible levels of increase for Southwold /Reydon, Halesworth and rural areas as well as not overloading Lowestoft.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John and Barbara Carter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 514

Comment Option 3 is the least of the evils. All will encourage Beccles to be absorbed into a greater Lowestoft. Options 2 and 3 will almost certainly result in housing sprawl and little if any real economic growth.
John Lavery

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 236

Comment I visited the Exhibition at the Rifle hall Halesworth on the evening of the 17th May. At the meeting we were presented with 4 general options. If there has to be development in an area that is currently losing jobs, then....... I strongly favour option One.
Waveney should keep the bulk of ANY new development confined to existing settlements (absolutely NO new settlements) and the largest of these (Lowestoft) should take the overwhelming bulk of new development. Development should be concentrated where there is already good infrastructure, an urban environment, and exclusively on brownfield sites wherever possible. Green spaces, agricultural land, undeveloped land near the coast and inland should be avoided for any new development, until ALL the brownfield and urban land is fully utilised.
John Trew

Section  
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  
15

Comment  
Options 1 and 4 are my preferred options. This spreads new housing right across Waveney. Most villages would take some limited development which in turn would help to support local shops that currently exist or encourage new local shops. I would not support the majority of development in Beccles and Worlingham which, in the case of the latter, is just a village.
Julian Rogers

Section: Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID: 507

Comment: Option 3 - it enables thriving communities to be developed. It will ensure adequate infrastructure support is built into the plans so developers contribute to the wider local communities benefiting not only the new residents but also the existing residents. It will also encourage the development of supporting industries/services and help maintain balanced communities across the District.
Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1409

Comment We consider that Option 1 (continue to focus growth in Lowestoft) presents the best option for new development over the plan period. Whilst we acknowledge that growth of various market towns and key service centres around the District is important, it is equally imperative that considerable residential growth takes place at locations which are within a vicinity of Lowestoft, where both existing and potential job opportunities are plentiful. It is also important to ensure that a proportion of residential growth throughout the District takes place at locations which utilize existing infrastructure resources and also existing community facilities, whilst also contributing to and improving these assets. The town of Lowestoft, and it’s nearby conurbations, are areas which are considered suitable of providing and supporting new housing development.
Kevin Kinsella

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2215

Comment In short, our preference would be Scenario 1, Option 1. However, we note that the figures provided do not include the planning application for 20 homes on Duncan's Building Yard and the project for around 25 homes on Green Lane (a formal application has yet to be filed). As a result, if the total number of additional homes ends up at around 104 dwellings, the net number of additional homes required would come out at around 59 homes.

In our view, this sort of figure could be met relatively easily via the development of the site accommodating the Southwold police station and the old fire station, the small-scale development of the various brown field sites likely to become available in Southwold over the next few years (i.e. the old Southwold Hospital, the telephone exchange, the old Kings Head pub etc.) and various small infill developments.

Even under a worst-case scenario for Southwold & Reydon, the amount of land that has been put up for development by landowners is well in excess of any foreseeable requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kimberley Martin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Larkfleet Homes
Seth Williams

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2148

Comment * The Local Plan must plan to deliver the strategic requirements of Waveney, including sufficient land to meet assessed housing and employment need. This includes making land allocations at all levels of the settlement hierarchy.

* The role of Beccles as the main settlement behind Lowestoft is supported. This is justified by the scale of the settlement and the level of service provision relative to the other settlements in the District.

We consider that the most appropriate scenario currently assessed is Option 2 which allows for a higher level of growth in Beccles. The reasons being that this option would have a greater positive impact on several Sustainability Appraisal (SA) objectives and is the most likely scenario to ensure that the OAN is met in full; alongside a greater chance of meeting affordable housing needs. Furthermore, Option 1 presents some likely negative impacts and is the scenario least likely to deliver the OAN in full.

The SA identifies that Beccles has a good range of services and facilities and that development of scale may help provide additional services and facilities to the benefit of the town. Also, that growth in Beccles would benefit from the services and facilities it offers by enabling future residents to walk and cycle to access services and jobs which would enhance the health and wellbeing of the population through encouraging more active lifestyles. The SA further identifies that there is strong market demand in Beccles with higher prices than Lowestoft, which may provide more scope to secure affordable housing. The split of development between Beccles and Lowestoft would also provide greater certainty that objectively assessed needs could realistically be delivered.

Furthermore, the SA notes that environmental impacts of Option 2 would be preferable to other options in that some of the landscapes around Lowestoft are particularly sensitive to development such that reducing the level of development towards Lowestoft would ease pressures on these landscapes whilst a more significant level of growth at Beccles would be unlikely to have such a significant effect on the landscape. Similarly, the SA notes that with more significant levels of growth in Beccles it might be that
development in south Lowestoft could be avoided. This would also be beneficial in terms of conserving biodiversity and geodiversity given the sensitivity of south Lowestoft.

It is noted that the SA considers Option 2 to be less likely to deliver the same economic benefits unless the employment growth is focused in Lowestoft as there is less demand for employment growth in Beccles. However, this appears to neglect the fact that demand for employment growth is likely to increase with increased housing supply in Beccles to complement and support it. Growth in Beccles could sustain, and be sustained by, employment growth at the Ellough Business Park and Enterprise Zone. In terms of the rural economy, the SA does acknowledge that Option 2 would present a benefit to the rural area and we would endorse this on the basis that growth in Beccles would enable the town to better serve the surrounding rural area.

Furthermore, in terms of the town centre, a more significant level of growth at Beccles also provides an opportunity to enhance the viability and vitality of the town centre by increasing the local customer base and resultant footfall and consumer spend in the town centre. New development can support the economic vitality and viability of market town centres. Whilst the argument that Lowestoft has seen increase in retail unit vacancies is made, the recent trend for this has shown a sharp decrease. Whereas in the market towns, the vacancy rate increased sharply after 2006 and since then has fluctuated and not fallen to previous lower levels. Options 2 (and 3) which would see higher levels of growth across the District would support the vitality of the market towns.

Also, it should be noted that Lowestoft has 73% of the District's properties in Flood Zone 2 and 65% of the District's properties in Flood Zone 3. Increasing the levels of development in Lowestoft, or seeking to achieve the highest level proportion of growth there is not sustainable in the medium and long term; primarily due to the impacts of climate change. Taking a sequential approach to flood risk, Options 2 and 3 would reduce risk associated with flooding.

In light of the above, we would advocate Option 2 as the most beneficial development strategy of those proposed.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  1062

Comment  Each of the four options for new development within the District, as set out in the consultation document, continue to focus the highest proportion of new growth (albeit to varying degrees) within Lowestoft. As the largest settlement in the District, and with the best range of services and facilities, continuing to provide for a high proportion of the District's growth in Lowestoft is supported.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1236

Comment Each of the four options for new development within the District, as set out in the consultation document, continue to focus the highest proportion of new growth (albeit to varying degrees) within Lowestoft. As the largest settlement in the District and with the best range of services and facilities, it is supported that a high proportion of the District's growth should continue to be focussed in Lowestoft.
Louis Smith

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 567

Comment I believe option 1 is the most appropriate, with growth focused on Lowestoft. This is where shops, employment and other facilities already exist.
Lowestoft & Waveney Chamber of Commerce Linda Thornton

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2233

Comment LWCoC favours Option 2 which, whilst focusing most growth on Lowestoft, also allows for significant growth in Beccles and Worlingham although we would not want to see new housing in those towns developed simply to service employment outside the District.
Lynette Meen

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  1629

Comment  Option 1 - if 3rd bridge built this is sustainable re traffic.
Lynette Meen

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  1637

Comment  If homes built in Beccles I worry about traffic in town and doctors/schools coping. I understand some need to be built and perhaps do 100 every 2 years but in large numbers in one go is not ideal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>With regards to the Local Plan 2016 – 2036 we consider that Option 3 would be a fairer option for the reduction of urban sprawl in North Lowestoft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M J Edwards & Partners Chris Edwards  
Strutt & Parker LLP (Fiona Harte)

**Section**  
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

**Comment ID**  
2066

**Comment**  
It is proposed that Option 3 represents the most appropriate and deliverable spatial approach to growth - Spread development more evenly across market towns and rural areas, is the most suitable option for growth within Waveney District. This option allows for development to be appropriately but more evenly spread across the district, ensuring that development isn't solely concentrated on larger settlements. In this way the distribution of development is more effectively spread balancing deliverability with sustainability.

Allowing for more growth in rural areas should result in an increase in the provision of level of services and facilities in the rural countryside. The figure of 11-14% of residential development in rural areas is therefore considered to be the most appropriate option. This would result in 924 to 1,143 new homes between 2011 and 2036 across the rural settlements. This distribution of growth will enable settlements like Corton with a good range of shops, services and facilities to receive a proportion of new development, which commensurate with their size.
Margaret Dinn

**Section**
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

**Comment ID**
1437

**Comment**
I would like to signal my support for Scenario 1, Option 1 of the options contained in the new Waveney Local Plan document.
Mr and Mrs J V Palin

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  601

Comment  In regard to the forward building plan for Waveney District, we think OPTION 1 is the best solution, reason being suitable development land being scarce and public services limited in the town of Bungay, any development would need to be limited, so we therefore think the only option that would be most suited to Bungays needs is OPTION 1.
Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 171

Comment Option 1. Use of brownfield sites. Nearest to off shore wind development.
Dixon

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  402

Comment  Option 1 or option 4 are the only practical proposals. Lowestoft is the only town which has the infrastructure suitable to support development.
Haycock

Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 883

Comment

Most development should be focussed on Lowestoft. Option 1, given the four put forward, but with implementation treating Worlingham as separate to 'Beccles with Worlingham' and with the qualification that any growth should not be disproportionate to the size of the village's population.

Note: Worlingham's population increased by 13.6% between 2001 and 2011. Treatment as a growth zone for Beccles risks destroying the village as an entity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McGregor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jane Saunders

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 175

Comment In general, in Halesworth, although there is a need for some social housing, our road system / infrastructure and facilities in the 'market town' are inadequate to facilitate major new housing estates. There is one primary school, one supermarket and one doctors surgery already under pressure and limited employment. The swimming pool and middle school have been demolished and although there are plans for future sports facilities and a new pool, these will be many years in the planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicky Elliott

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 720

Comment Option 4
| Norman Castleton |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Section**     | Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?                       |
| **Comment ID**  | 412                                                                                                               |
| **Comment**     | Option one. Less good countryside will be ruined                                                                  |
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1174

Comment Wherever good employment can be created
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1665

Comment Option 3 – Spread development more evenly across market towns and rural areas
Reasons:
Lowestoft does not have the road infrastructure, medical facilities or schools, to be able to provide 75% of the growth over the next 20 years. Oulton already suffers from inadequate road infrastructure, lack of medical facilities and lack of primary school places. The current development of 800 extra homes on Woods Meadow will only add to these problems.
Southwold and Halesworth Councils have said they are in need of more homes. Southwold in particular need homes for local people, as too many existing homes are second homes or holiday lets.
Pamela Cyprien

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1257

Comment I feel Option 1 would be the most sensible. I do not think that Reydon/Southwold can sustain even a 3% growth over that which is currently planned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pamela Morris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pat Took

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 814

Comment I prefer Option 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>With regard to growth for housing, we would favour option 1 (page 12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Cockerton and Karen Evans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Option 2. Option 1 is too much for Lowestoft. Options 3 and 4 would mean more development in rural areas. The rural character of this part of the country is very valuable both for wildlife and for the people who live here and those who visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peter Norman</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Option 3 spreads any new development and gives the small market towns some necessary growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peter Scott

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 396

Comment Option 3 plans too much growth for Bungay. Without a by-pass it would create traffic congestion and put too much pressure on public services such as schools and health services. There are not many local jobs so the scale of development would foster commuting and traffic congestion. It would also lose valuable agricultural land.

Option 1 is preferred as there are more jobs in Lowestoft to sustain employment and reduce commuting journeys.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>option 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rebecca Brough

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 639

Comment Option 3. By increasing growth in rural areas it encourages better transport links and larger communities. Shops, pubs etc. are supported and small schools stay open.
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2074

Comment We would favour the majority of the proposed increase in housing needed across the District to be located in Lowestoft and Beccles, given that these are the main areas of employment. Moreover, well managed expansion of Lowestoft, along with the proposed development of the third river crossing and the facilities to support off-shore wind energy, would support regeneration where it is most needed in the District. If this approach is taken in the Local Plan, the housing target for Southwold and Reydon would be at the lower end of the range set out in the consultation.
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2075

Comment [Therefore] none of the proposed large sites offered for development around Reydon (5,6,38, 117,18,138 in the options consultation, p51) will be needed and we believe these should not be considered for designation as development sites in the final Local Plan. Our residents strongly opposed the expansion of the village envelope in their response to the consultation for our Village Plan in 2014 which was confirmed more recently in the public response to the current application to develop land at St Felix School (site 138). There is simply no case for major development of housing or business accommodation on any of these sites, given the analysis of the housing needs set out above and the availability of undeveloped land at the current Reydon Business Park.
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2076

Comment More specifically related to our community, we would oppose any widespread new growth in our locality for three key reasons:

a. the entire area beyond the settlement of Reydon is either sea or the AONB which includes areas of national significance such as freshwater reed beds; any expansion of Reydon (or Southwold) will involve significant encroachment into the AONB which is not acceptable to residents. Indeed, the recent Planning Inspector's decision to reject the appeal to extend Reydon Business Park into the countryside was rejected because of the harm that would be done to the AONB as had been strongly argued by residents;

b. the fact that at least half of all new housing will become second homes and thus not meet local need arising from population growth;

c. significant concerns about the lack of adequate infrastructure, including the sewage system which is at or above its capacity in much of our locality. This was confirmed in Section 5.2.4 of Waveney DC & Great Yarmouth BC – Joint Water Cycle Strategy, Final Scoping Report, published in 2009 when the current Local Plan was being developed. The report states "Southwold (with Reydon) WwTW (serving PE of 9,700) is also identified in this document as having very limited capacity available and requiring investment before any future growth". Since then a significant number of new houses have been developed in Southwold and Reydon, including the 127 noted in the report which have been built or gaine planning approval since 2011. The Parish Council is already highly concerned about problems experienced by residents which include sewage blockages, sewage emissions in and around residential properties and apparent sewage (as well as surface water) overflows into open dykes in periods of heavy rainfall.

d. the traffic and safety issues that would arise from the development of any of the proposed large sites requiring access onto the busy main Lowestoft or Halesworth Roads or the unsuitable minor road of Green Lane. It is significant that a smaller site close to site 6 was ruled out of consideration for relocation of threatened coastal properties under the Pathfinder scheme because of concerns about unsafe access to the busy Lowestoft Road in this area. The traffic implications and unsafe access onto
the Halesworth Road of the currently proposed development at St Felix (site 138) is one of the key reasons for the Parish Council's opposition to this application.
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2077

Comment Currently, we know that 20 affordable units will be developed on the Duncan’s Yard site in Southwold and 23 will be built at Green Lane in Reydon. In the options where development is focussed in Lowestoft and/or Beccles, the target figures for Southwold and Reydon (after houses built or already approved since 2011, the start date for all the figures) are in a range of 104-159 which does not include Duncan’s Yard or Green Lane (or the Service Station site where 13 houses will be built) as they do not yet have planning permission. This target then reduces to 48-103, up to 40 of which will be on the other Station Road sites (identified as Site 142 in the consultation).

With regard to housing, the remaining target for Southwold and Reydon could be met by the development of the Station Road site (142), some infill development in Reydon and modest expansion of the Reydon village envelope on the lines already allowed for affordable housing under the Rural Exceptions policy (DM22).
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2078

Comment In Reydon, we believe that at Elliott Avenue and off Mount Pleasant there are two small infill sites which could be designated for affordable housing. We believe that the site identified as Jubilee, Green Lane (site 26), adjacent to the site already identified for affordable housing, is suitable for a mixed development of affordable and low cost housing. The site of the temporary pharmacy adjacent to Reydon Health centre should be developed, either for housing or mixed uses. Depending on the density of development, these sites could meet the target. Other potential sites for modest extension of the settlement of the village are the land adjacent to the Crescents (where road layout confirms an earlier intention to extend the development there) and the land on either side of Wangford Road from the existing housing towards the Church. The Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to meet Planning Officers to explore further these potential sites.
Robert Baggott

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1049

Comment OPTION 3
Robert Gill

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 374

Comment Our strong preference is for Option One - focusing the majority on Lowestoft. The reasons are:
   It supports the general principle in earlier development plans that growth should, wherever possible, be focused on areas with significant brownfield development potential, thus protecting the rural environment of the rest of the area. WDC has demonstrated robustly in the past that the required number of new homes can be accommodated by this means.
   Developing the market towns and surrounding rural areas - options two and three - runs the risk of damaging the unique character of these settlements. The Waveney area is highly fortunate in that it has a number of extremely attractive market towns, which preserve a unique characteristic of local communities of manageable size. The over development of these towns, especially the villages, will cause increased problems with parking and traffic flow. Whereas, the work already carried out to develop the infrastructure in Lowestoft, together with future developments such as the third river crossing, will accommodate increased numbers of houses.
   We oppose the fourth option to develop a new settlement. This is not necessary and will detract from the ambience of the area. However carefully designed new units are, they will always appear out of keeping with the general area.
Robert Williamson

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 502

Comment option 3 is probably the only one as you cannot build many more houses in the Lowestoft area until you sought out the third river crossing the problem with the level crossing in Oulton Broad
Rosemary Simpson

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  1003

Comment  I prefer option 1 or 4 as these have less impact on the beautiful quaint town of Beccles. Please don't shoot the golden goose
Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1361

Comment
Options 1 & 2 are my options for distribution of new development. I have a preference for Option 1. This should focus growth in already significantly populated areas which have the potential for employment opportunities growth.

Small market towns and rural areas have a lesser ability to provide increasing employment opportunities and a 3% target is arguably too high. Lowestoft is the place crying out for better housing, regeneration and has possibilities of being a substantial employment hub.

Overall I appreciate the need for forward planning and recognise the arguments in relation to the need for more housing. However growth of housing should be in areas where the need is supported by employment opportunities – this surely means that increases should be targeted towards major towns and not smaller towns and villages that do not have significant possibilities of expanding employment?

I strongly feel that there is no clear evidence that Southwold and Reydon are going to offer expanding employment opportunities of any significance. Nor have I detected significant plans in the pipeline that would change this. As such, occupancy of any new homes would be on a 'dormitory' basis or, more likely, as 'second homes'. Please, please, please we do not want any more 'second homes'!

I have a strong preference for Option 1. However, irrespective of the Option that is eventually chosen, the footprint of the suggested sites is much much larger for the number of houses identified as being appropriate for Reydon. Therefore, the size of the areas subsequently approved must be significantly reduced.

It needs to be clarified whether developments in progress count towards the numbers you are looking for. I believe there is an application for 20 homes on 'Duncan's Yard', 25 homes on Green Lane (application to be submitted), an unknown number on the Police/Fire Station site. If these are taken off the 104 homes ‘target (3% growth) then you will need to identify only a small amount of land. There is the possibility of development of the Kings Head Public house site and of the Old Telephone Exchange site – these two sites would afford a further significant number of homes.

In relation to development in Southwold and Reydon I think it would be
safer to have one single site earmarked for development. The size of this should be restricted and it would become 'the site' and we would be secure that development of other sites would be more likely to be refused should planning permission be sought. If multiple sites are put in the plan there is a danger that developers will try and extend the footprint of these.

I do not have sufficient knowledge of most of the areas, to enable meaningful detailed comment. However, as a resident of Reydon, I can comment on the suggestions for Southwold and Reydon. The planned areas, numbered 5,6,26,117,118,138 & 143, when combined, are excessive in size for any of the options suggested and should be reduced in number and/or size.

In summary, can you:

1. Focus housing development on Lowestoft and large towns
2. Suggest housing development in villages only at a time when there are increased employment opportunities (employment triggers development, not the other way round!)
3. Restrict to the bare minimum development in villages. Don't spoil Suffolk.
4. Put in the plan, only sites that are constricted to a size that meets the forecast – don't put in sites for 600-700 homes if you are only planning for 100. This will mean removing or significantly restricting the footprint of some of the sites suggested for Southwold & Reydon.
5. Remove from the plan the St Felix Playing Field site – this is not an appropriate site.
6. Be very wary of, in respect of areas particularly driven by tourism, 'killing the golden goose'.
S Rossi

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  1566

Comment  Lowestoft needs more regeneration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S Rossi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>No more in Beccles – too many new houses none should be built on flood plains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>I moved from London to Beccles because I was sick of overcrowding not it looks like Beccles is going the same way. I look over fields and the common and would like to continue to do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S T Blower

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1573

Comment Ticked Option 3 –‘Spread development more evenly across market towns and rural areas’.
This would have the least impact and would not totally spoil any one area. 
But it does not provide for even spread across the market towns as 15% is allocated to Beccles and 18% to the other 3 towns put together. It is not fair to Beccles.
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

**Section**
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

**Comment ID**
607

**Comment**
Option 3 is best if rural areas are to survive but this needs to ensure appropriate infrastructure to support it. Focussing on railway and bus connections.
Sara Cross

Section  
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  
134

Comment  
Option 3. Traffic problems already in Lowestoft perhaps use a park and ride scheme. 
Should be first derelict or run down areas over grown.
Savills Philip Rankin

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2072

Comment We consider that Option 1 (continue to focus growth in Lowestoft) provides a suitable strategy for new development over the plan period. Whilst we acknowledge that growth of various market towns and key service centres around the District is important, it is equally imperative that considerable residential growth takes place at locations which are within a vicinity of large conurbations, where both existing and potential job opportunities are plentiful. It is also important to ensure that a proportion of residential growth throughout the District takes place at locations which utilize existing infrastructure resources and also existing community facilities, whilst in addition contributing to and improving these assets.

When considering the matter of improving local infrastructure and community facilities in relation to residential housing growth, please note that we believe Option 4 (new settlement) would afford an opportunity to allow for large scale development to take place in an advantageously measured approach, in tandem with ensuring that both community and transport infrastructure is improved and developed accordingly. However, it is critical to ensure that a new settlement does not unnecessarily impact the on the rural landscape, and should therefore only be considered at a location within a relative proximity to an existing development.

Consequently, we believe this Option could also offer an appropriate course forward.
Simon Clack

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1648

Comment More specifically, regarding the development options for the Southwold & Reydon area:
i/ working on the assumption that Scenario 1 and Option 1 are adopted for the new Local Plan, I believe that there is no need for any green field development in the Southwold & Reydon area. In effect, after taking into account housing already built or with planning permission since 2011, "only" 104 homes would need to be built in the area between now and 2036. Furthermore, after taking into account the planning application for 20 homes on Duncan’s Building Yard in Southwold and the 40 homes suggested for the Southwold police station and the old fire station (site number 142), the number of new homes required over the next 20 years drops to around 40 homes. This sort of figure should easily be met by the small-scale development of the various brown field sites that could become available in Southwold & Reydon over the next few years, i.e. the old Southwold hospital, the telephone exchange, the old Kings Head pub, etc, and various small infill developments. As a result, there would be no need to breach Reydon’s existing development boundary;
ii/ if a decision is taken to allocate a higher number of new homes to the Southwold & Reydon area (i.e. Option 3), I believe that a more "organic" expansion of Reydon’s development boundary would be achieved by developing the land to the north of Keens Lane. Although this site has not been submitted by the landowner for inclusion in the latest Local Plan, it was put forward in December 2006 (179 homes), it enjoys a number of existing access points, and when viewed on the map it seems the most "natural" area for expansion;
iii/ as regards the sites to the west and south of Keens Lane (site numbers 138, 116, and 117), I believe that they should all be excluded from any further consideration. The reasons for not developing the Saint Felix playing fields have already been well rehearsed (cf the comments made by local residents and organisations such as Sport England regarding planning reference: DC/15/3288/OUT) and many of the same arguments also apply to site numbers 116 and 117, specifically: a/ the land enjoys AONB status and there seems to be no reason why the Planning Inspectorates’ recent decision regarding the proposed Reydon Smere development (cf
APP/T3535/W/15/3131802) should not also apply to this area; b/ any vehicular access points from the A1095 would have to be located next to a blind corner or in a blind dip and would increase traffic on an already dangerous stretch of road. Any measures to remedy this situation (i.e. a roundabout) would only serve to further harm the character and appearance of the main gateway to Southwold & Reydon from the south; c/ developing these sites will encourage the landowner to fill-in the area between the solar farm and the Adnams distribution centre; and e/ the sites abut a pair of Grade II listed properties at the end of Keens Lane; iv/ it is essential that measures are taken to ensure that the "right sort" of housing is built. By way of an example, the outline proposals put forward by Saint Felix School for site number 138 reveal plans for a development that is similar to the neighbouring Saint Georges Square, and yet more than half of the homes on Saint Georges Square are holiday/second homes and the key worker homes have been sold on! Although section 106 agreements could be used, they only sure way to guarantee homes for local people is to build more council properties;
Stuart Lamb

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 877

Comment I think that option 3, an even spread is the best plan. That plan suggests that Beccles would take approximately 15% of the district's allocation. I do not think that the infrastructure and historic core of Beccles could cope with an allocation exceeding this.

I am not a "nimby" but I do not think Beccles should be forced to take development levels which would destroy its market town character. It is a beautiful place to live and work and I would hope that development could leave it that way.
Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 72

Comment option3
Section: Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID: 76

Comment: without a 3rd crossing into Lowestoft and improved roads, there is little point to any new development in Lowestoft as the rest of District struggles to access to area
Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2124

Comment Option 3 'Spread development more evenly across market towns and rural areas' is the preferred option to the Somerleyton Estate. We would direct the local planning authority to the guidance on rural housing in the NPPG which states:

"Rural Housing
How should local authorities support sustainable rural communities?
Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306
It is important to recognise the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability, and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements. This is clearly set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in the core planning principles, the section on supporting a prosperous rural economy and the section on housing.
A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities.
Assessing housing need and allocating sites should be considered at a strategic level and through the Local Plan and/or neighbourhood plan process. However, all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.
The National Planning Policy Framework also recognises that different sustainable transport policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas."

Option 3 is the option which best responds to that guidance because it proposes the highest proportion of housing to the rural area. At 14% of 1143 dwellings across a plan period of 25 years equates to a small figure of 45 dwellings per year to be distributed across potentially a number of settlements.
These are small figures and will be better apportioned to sustainable rural settlements with facilities and services which will benefit from the proportionate boost in existing housing stock.
Option 3 'Spread development more evenly across market towns and rural areas' is the preferred option to the Sotterley Estate. We direct the local planning authority to the guidance on rural housing in the NPPG which states:

"Rural Housing
How should local authorities support sustainable rural communities?
Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306

It is important to recognise the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability, and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements. This is clearly set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in the core planning principles, the section on supporting a prosperous rural economy and the section on housing.

A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities. Assessing housing need and allocating sites should be considered at a strategic level and through the Local Plan and/or neighbourhood plan process. However, all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.

The National Planning Policy Framework also recognises that different sustainable transport policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas."

Option 3 is the option which best responds to that guidance because it proposes the highest proportion of housing to the rural area. At 14% of 1143 dwellings across a plan period of 25 years equates to a small figure of 45 dwellings per year to be distributed across a number of settlements. These are small figures and will be better apportioned to sustainable rural settlements with facilities and services which will benefit from the
proportionate boost in existing housing stock.
Southwold & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce Guy Mitchell

Section
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID
1658

Comment
Introduction
Southwold and Reydon are relatively small communities in comparison to other market towns within the District. Southwold, despite its size, maintains a significant national profile and punches above its weight in economic terms. As a destination for visitors it plays an important part in the makeup of the economy of the whole district. The Development Plan whilst meeting the needs of the existing community must encourage change and opportunities for the future. The plan will also need to take account of the role of visitors who make a significant economic contribution to the area.

Natural Environment
The beauty of the natural environment is one of the key factors in attracting people to live, work and visit the area. Consequently, the overriding consideration of the Plan should be to protect the natural environment. Expansion of housing or business premises into areas designated as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or sites of Special Scientific Interest should not be considered. In addition, land bordering these areas should subject to strict controls to protect the area’s appearance.
**Southwold & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce Guy Mitchell**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We are in favour of options suggesting more housing in Lowestoft and Beccles. We favour 3% of the forecast new housing to be distributed around the market towns, including Southwold and Reydon. Therefore, none of the proposed large sites offered for development around Reydon will be needed and these should not be considered for designation as development sites in the final Local Plan. The current market suggests that around 50% of any new housing offered on the open market in the area will be purchased as second homes. Building significant stocks of new housing in this area will therefore be largely ineffective in tackling a housing shortage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We strongly favour Option 1 because this fits best with the much needed strategy to regenerate Lowestoft and gain the maximum benefit from the development of offshore wind and the building of the third crossing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1423

Comment 3. How Much Expansion Is Needed in Southwold and Reydon?

We strongly support the options proposed which concentrate the forecast need for more housing in Lowestoft or in Lowestoft and Beccles. This is not only because we think that the scope for expansion in Southwold and Reydon is severely limited if the balance we seek is to be achieved but because we recognise that Lowestoft is the key driver of the local economy and that any planning strategy must support its continued regeneration. With the establishment of the third river crossing and the development of the infrastructure to support new offshore wind energy, Lowestoft is poised for major economic growth which will both require, and meet the employment needs of, a growth in population. Thus we favour 3% of the forecast new housing to be distributed around the market towns, including Southwold and Reydon.

Therefore, none of the proposed large sites offered for development around Reydon will be needed and we believe these should not be considered for designation as development sites in the final Local Plan.

Reydon residents strongly opposed the expansion of the village envelope in their response to the consultation for the Reydon Village Plan in 2014 which was confirmed more recently in the public response to the current application to develop land at St Felix School (site 138 in the current options consultation). There is simply no case for major development of housing or business accommodation on any of these sites, given the analysis of the housing needs set out above and the availability of undeveloped land at the current Reydon Business Park.

More specifically related to our community, we would oppose any widespread new growth in our locality for four key reasons:

• The loss of open AONB land that would inevitably result (see section 2 above);

• the fact that at least half of all new housing will become second homes and thus not meet local need arising from population growth;

• significant concerns about the lack of adequate infrastructure, including the sewage system which is at or above its capacity in much of our locality, as was confirmed in 2009, since when considerable further housing has been developed. Residents regularly report concerns about sewage
spillages, drain blockages and flooding in several areas of the locality;
• the traffic and safety issues that would arise from the development of any
of the proposed large sites requiring access onto the busy main Lowestoft
or Halesworth Roads or the unsuitable minor road of Green Lane. Indeed,
one of these sites (site 6) or one very close to it was considered for the
Pathfinder project and rejected due to traffic and access issues onto the
Lowestoft Road.
Currently, we know that 20 affordable units will be developed on the
Duncan's Yard site in Southwold and 23 will be built at Green Lane in
Reydon. In the options where development is focussed in Lowestoft and/or
Beccles, the target figures for Southwold and Reydon (after houses built or
already approved since 2011, the start date for all the figures) are in a range
of 104-159 which does not include Duncan's Yard or Green Lane (or the
Service Station sites where 13 houses will be built) as they do not yet have
planning permission. This target then reduces to 48-103, some of which will
be on the other Station Road sites (identified as Site 142 in the
consultation).
The remaining housing target for Southwold and Reydon could be met by
the development of the Station Road site (site 142), some infill
development in Reydon and possibly some minor development on the lines
already allowed for affordable housing under the Rural Exceptions policy
(DM22).
We are aware that Reydon Parish Council has explored such an approach
and we urge serious consideration is given to any sites the Parish Council
may identify.
This approach would involve small scale development at several locations
rather than one or more major developments. If the priority is given in the
Local Plan to development of smaller lower cost units and affordable
housing, then such expansion would help meet the needs of local families
and thus maintain the balance and viability of the community.
Comments on the Sites Offered for Development in Southwold and Reydon
Please see our comments in the on-line questionnaire. We support
development on the brownfield site 142 in Southwold and consider
development of affordable housing and/or small lower cost commercial
housing on site 26 would be acceptable. We strongly oppose development
on all other sites offered around Reydon (5,6,38,117,118,138,142) because
these would involve inappropriate development in the countryside and
AONB, are of a scale not needed to meet the targets based on assessed
housing need and would place untenable pressure on the transport and
sewage infrastructure which are already at or beyond capacity.
## Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Option 3, which calls for 6% of growth to be located in S &amp; R, is not viable due to inadequate infrastructure, (structures, systems and facilities serving the community and necessary for its function), lack of land in Southwold, and lack of suitable land in Reydon. S &amp; R are part of the AONB, and that needs to be taken into account in locating new development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
St James South Elmham Parish Meeting Mary Henry

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 804

Comment We believe Option 2 to be the most appropriate for Waveney. While maintaining the focus of investment on Lowestoft infrastructure and supporting its development as a centre of excellence, this also allows for continuing proportionate development in the major market towns. Option 1 would result in the over-dominance of Lowestoft and its growth; Option 3 would require extensive improvements to district infrastructure, seriously limited at present, and unnecessarily provide for significant increase in rural housing. Option 4 is unlikely to succeed without major investment in infrastructure enhancement of all kinds across the district as an essential prerequisite.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | In terms of the Spatial Options for Growth, unfortunately none of the options put forward allow Bungay to properly thrive and prosper. Bungay, like a lot of towns in Suffolk, needs investment into the local economy and it needs to be an attractive place to live and to provide sufficient homes at affordable prices, which enable local people in Bungay to have access to appropriate housing. The suggested spread of new homes to Bungay in each of the scenarios ranges from 2% to 4%. This equates to between approximately 150-380 new homes between 2011 and 2036. At the highest rate this is only 15 new homes per year over the period; and at the lower rate only 6 dwellings per year. Furthermore, 150 of their homes have been permitted already. This level of growth is not enough to:
1. Meet the housing needs in Bungay, and
2. Ensure that Bungay thrives and prospers. More people living in the town will inevitably mean more people spending money in the town. |
Stephen Read

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  247

Comment  Option 3 - Spreads the growth across the community, integrating new housing and sharing facilities.
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 2216

Comment Transport

The county council has various duties relating to transport and its function as the Highway Authority. This includes the production of a Local Transport Plan, and the current version (the Third Suffolk Local Transport Plan - LTP3) promotes sustainable travel, which accords with national transport and planning policies.

The county council will continue to work with the District Council to identify what information is needed to promote sustainable modes of travel and to manage the residual cumulative highway impacts of development.

There is likely to be a need to deliver growth in Waveney in a flexible manner, to support the vitality of rural settlements and rural services. However, dispersed patterns of growth do not tend to encourage sustainable travel and put greater emphasis on subsidised public transport services. There may well be opportunities to support existing services to ensure more longer-term viability and the county council would welcome further dialogue with Waveney District Council on this matter.

With regard to a new settlement of 2,000 homes, this is unlikely to generate viable demand for public transport services or adequate transport infrastructure including, amongst others, new rail connections.

In general, the proposed growth options have been tested against various transport models and the accessibility to a train station was identified as one of the main factors identifying sustainable locations for new development within Waveney. Network Rail identifies the train route across the Waveney district as part of the wider rail network 'The Great Eastern Main Line' (GEML). Generally, the GEML carries key commuter flows into London as well as connects regional centres and moves a significant amount of freight generated by the port of Felixstowe. The railway lines between Ipswich and Lowestoft and Lowestoft and Norwich experience limited capacity. The Anglian Route Study (March 2016) published by Network Rail states an aspiration to increase the passenger service frequency between these three regional centres over the long-term.

Lowestoft

The current UK Infrastructure Plan (2016) includes the provision funds for a third river crossing in Lowestoft (subject to final business case approval).
The benefits of the scheme have been tested against different growth scenarios as summarised in the Outline Business Case - Lake Lothing Third Crossing, Lowestoft (Dec 2015). The report confirms that the proposed scheme demonstrates that it offers very high value for money based on Waveney-district-wide growth of 3,304 more households and 3,157 jobs between 2015 and 2035. This is lower than the rate of growth set out in scenario 1.

The Third Crossing would still offer very good value for money with an even lower growth scenario. It is therefore, unlikely that the resultant district-wide growth could affect the overall case for the Crossing. With the existing pressures on the crossings over the Waveney, any substantial extension north of Lowestoft would be undesirable without the Third Crossing in place.

In 2006, the Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (LTP 2) referred to a scheme for improving the A146 from Beccles to Lake Lothing (Barnby/Carlton Colville Bypass). However, the scheme recorded a lower priority and was then not included in the current LTP 3 (2011 – 2031). The potential for this project is likely to be raised alongside the proposed development south of Lowestoft including a new road linking the A146 and A12.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1474

Comment Growth Options
Whilst we have specific comments on the growth options presented, consideration of the options should take account of ecologically sensitive areas (especially statutory and non-statutory designated sites). It should be ensured that the plan includes policy to protect, extend and enhance such areas and to ensure that they are not allocated for development or included in settlement boundary changes.
Susan Harrison

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  2190

Comment  Option 1 and Option 2. Because the infrastructure is already in place. And brownfield sites can be regenerated, leaving greenfield sites en enable agriculture and the population to enjoy their leisure.
Tegerdine
Ingleton Wood LLP (Sarah Hornbrook)

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1253

Comment On behalf of Martin and Lawrence Tegerdine, we wish to support Growth Option 1, to continue to focus growth in Lowestoft. Lowestoft is the largest settlement within the District, and has the greatest range of services and facilities available to residents. It therefore represents the most sustainable option for accommodating the growth planned for the District. This approach will best support the ongoing regeneration of Lowestoft, bringing additional income into the town.
**Terence White**

**Section**  
Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

**Comment ID**  
769

**Comment**  
Option 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teresa Cooper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teresa Cooper

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 714

Comment option 4 would be best. To limit growth in existing towns to avoid overloading existing infrastructure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terry McDonald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1521

Comment We reject Options 1 & 2 as counterproductive to the balance of Waveney economy into the Market Towns. Option 3 We would support Option 3; that development should be spread more evenly across market towns and rural areas. Option 4 We strongly reject any plan for a new settlement as this would undermine the present Market Towns in the Waveney area.
Tim Meadows  
Savills (Philip Rankin)  

Section  Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  1412

Comment  We consider that Option 1 (continue to focus growth in Lowestoft) presents the best option for new development over the plan period. Whilst we acknowledge that growth of various market towns and key service centres around the District is important, it is equally imperative that considerable residential growth takes place at locations which are within a vicinity of large conurbations, where both existing and potential job opportunities are plentiful. It is also important to ensure that a proportion of residential growth throughout the District takes place at locations which utilize existing infrastructure resources and also existing community facilities, whilst also contributing to and improving these assets. The town of Lowestoft, and Carlton Colville to the south, are settlements that are considered suitable of providing and supporting new housing development.
Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1397

Comment We consider that Option 1 (continue to focus growth in Lowestoft) presents the best option for new development over the plan period. Whilst we acknowledge that growth of various market towns and key service centres around the District is important, it is equally imperative that considerable residential growth takes place at locations which are within a vicinity of Lowestoft, where both existing and potential job opportunities are plentiful. It is also important to ensure that a proportion of residential growth throughout the District takes place at locations which utilize existing infrastructure resources and also existing community facilities, whilst also contributing to and improving these assets. The town of Lowestoft, and its nearby conurbations, are areas which are considered suitable of providing and supporting new housing development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Webb Information Technology Services Ltd Tony Tibbenham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellington Construction Ltd  Paul Pitcher  
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Combination of Option 1, 3 &amp; 4 (taking on board potential growth in Halesworth and provision of a new settlement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worlingham Neighbourhood Planning Team Wendy Summerfield
Wendy Summerfield

Section Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1655

Comment We also note that in the Waveney 'Call For Sites' for development, about 40% of the land in what is called 'Beccles' appears to be within the curtilage of Worlingham. We ask that this be addressed and that Worlingham be considered as the independent village it is and not as a housing estate attached to Beccles as the powers that be appear to see us.
**Worlingham Neighbourhood Planning Team Wendy Summerfield**

**Wendy Summerfield**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q07 Which option for the distribution of new development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>With regards to the 4 options suggested by WDC, we agree that the majority of the development should be where the facilities and infrastructure currently is ie Lowestoft. However, we feel that the other market towns of Bungay and Halesworth should take a more proportionate share of the development as they have similar or better amenities than Beccles. The 4 options do not reflect this nor the fact that the Campus Project in Halesworth is ongoing and that Halesworth has rail connections with Ipswich and onward to London and other places. Using the WDC data which predicts the amount of development needed within Waveney District, we have established that the number of dwellings needed in the village of WORLINGHAM equates to 9.2 units per anum. We feel that this is an acceptable amount of development in a Village the size of Worlingham, given the lack of amenities and facilities we have. (see attached info) [see file]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Adam Hook

Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 406

Comment Yes - more at Bungay. The place is moving towards being a ghost town and needs a shot in the arm. Also significant social housing in Southwold to deter ever more Londoners buying second homes there and driving up prices for true locals.
Alan Baguste

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 761

Comment Where should the growth go? 95% in and around Lowestoft. Other Approach. Waveney DC operates a professional Planning Department and development initiatives are produced and for, and decisioned by, elected representatives. This consultation is predicated almost solely upon a number of landowners offering potential building plots for Sale. Apart from the ribbon development, south of Lowestoft. How would WDC plan the future development if it had a clean sheet and limitless powers to apply CPOs?
Anonymous

Section  Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID  246

Comment  Beccles, whilst a thriving town can only cope with a certain level of new housing. More investment needed in the town. Likewise, Halesworth and Bungay need investment and low level housing developments. Small industrial areas (already existing) near small towns could be better used for businesses. Currently empty housing should be an option for regeneration.
Anonymous

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 317

Comment If you over develop the small towns and villages people who have come to live here as a semi rural area will move away and their homes will just sell as holiday/2nd homes. We must do all we can to retain the residents who live here permanently.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 331

Comment Expansion is always needed as we move forward. This part of East Anglia is a very special and individual area which must not have its identity eroded. Any expansion must be sympathetic to the individual areas whilst addressing future needs of housing and business.
Anonymous

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1642

Comment Brown fields - always first choice.
AP and AE Wolton

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1615

Comment Southwold and Reydon Development.
Comments on proposed sites.
1. First priority should be for sites within the existing town and village boundaries.
2. Following development of the above – further sites if required, should be on sites already proposed and agreed with present owners.
B Raymond

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1338

Comment In connection with the above consultation I am forwarding my views in respect of Reydon and Southwold accordingly.

HOUSING NEEDS

Given the nature of the Southwold and Reydon area it should be carefully understood what this area represents. It is a major tourist hotspot where people come to admire and enjoy the quaintness of the town and the surrounding countryside and thus contribute to the local economy. There are little or no employment opportunities for the young or anyone else in this immediate area so any large scale housing will mean that those buying or occupying new housing will need to travel to find work. This would put an unbearably strain on the local road infrastructure which, even at current levels and at times struggles to meet vehicular demand through increased heavy goods traffic in the area. I see no purpose in providing large scale developments in areas where there are few work opportunities as this only leads to the carbon footprint increasing to the detriment of the rural dynamics.

AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB)

We have already seen the consequences of allowing development which sits very uncomfortable within an area of outstanding natural beauty and always provokes an adverse comment from tourists and locals alike. I am of course referring to the Arabian knights castle painted white which can be seen for miles across the estuary. No further infringement on areas of outstanding natural beauty should ever be considered as this is part of the jewel in the crown for Southwold and Reydon which attracts so many walkers, hikers and bikers not only during the summer but all year round. It should be considered very carefully when deciding on large developments that you don’t destroy the very essence of what brings people to the area and ultimately spend money in the local economy. Therefore in conclusion, no such large developments including St Felix School should be considered to the southwest side of Halesworth Road as this would be a further erosion of the beauty of the area.

EXISTING DEVELOPMENT ALREADY AGREED

There are two proposed development sites in the vicinity of Station Road, Southwold already and a number of infill sites appear to have sprung up
throughout Reydon which will provide some further dwellings and not require any encroachment onto agricultural or greenbelt land. Large scale developments should be confined to town areas where people can more easily commute via bike/walking etc so as to cut down on carbon emissions and protect wildlife areas. Lowestoft is badly in need of renewal of new housing stock and to uplift the face of Lowestoft which at the moment is pretty dire. Therefore I believe the Local Plan should concentrate on positioning future large scale development in this and other large town areas. Reydon and Southwold is at the moment at a sustainable level and should not be looked at for potential large scale population growth as this would be to the detriment of tourism which so many small local businesses depend on.
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1994

Comment We do not consider that there are any alternative options to those set out in the document.
**Beccles Society Paul Fletcher**

**Section**
Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

**Comment ID**
1399

**Comment**
Beccles Society would be opposed to any new settlement as it would be likely to suffer from the same problems of decline as Bungay and Halesworth unless a significant employer is introduced, which is considered to be unlikely. Furthermore any new settlement would need to be located near to a high quality road connection (eg A12), thus limiting the choice of site. Locations suggested between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth or between Lowestoft and Beccles are non-starters as they would just result in urban sprawl with towns virtually linked together.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1084

Comment Fewer houses in Carlton Colville which has become a commuter town.
**chris Morris**

**Section**

Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

**Comment ID**

1605

**Comment**

Unused railway land approaching main station. Consider moving station west and using the land for development.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1792

Comment See below [A new development to the South/West of the region between Bungay and Halesworth could be the answer as suitable infrastructure could be developed at the same time.]
David Burman

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 637

Comment Do not build on agriculture land and use green sites for middle to large development. There are many brownfield sites in the town that can be utilised. Restrict development in the rural location due to the lack of infrastructure such as doctors surgery's, shops, bus services. If large scale rural development occurs road use will increase, and the present infrastructure could not cope.
Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1594

Comment In principal I would use brownfield sites and not use greenfield sites. There are significant environmental consequences to using greenfield sites which will affect wildlife, the attractivity of location and safety where new infrastructure is implemented.
Gill Armstrong

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1894

Comment I don't want to stop progress and development. Many people live in the surrounding villages because they are villages with a fairly low crime rate, increasing them massively can only be a bad thing. I agree that some housing is required for local, young people, not second home buyers but even if affordable housing is built, it usually gets sold on to second home owners or landlords, then we are back to square one, needing more housing, this should be addressed before new developments are allowed. I also think that derelict and disused buildings should be used before building new. Amenities, utilities and access also need careful consideration, any possible expansion needs to be thought of in the long term especially regarding the cost to the environment. I do not think that it is a case of just building wherever a green space is offered for development, far more thought and research should go into these decisions.
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 360

Comment A new community could be a good approach - at least the infrastructure would have to be provided, rather than overloading infrastructure in existing communities.
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1344

Comment The Greater Norwich authorities have no preferred view on the growth options, but note that further growth in Beccles and Bungay will help in meeting some of the service needs of current and future South Norfolk residents in the Waveney valley. Allowing more growth in market towns may also help secure higher delivery of housing.
A new settlement might be considered, and if so, should be considered for potential beyond the end of the Plan period (i.e. for more than 2,000 homes), due to the high infrastructure costs associated with such a proposal, and the frequently long lead-in time for schemes such as these.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
James Toole

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 194

Comment Not green belt near Carlton Colville. Area around Beccles south and east should be developed in conjunction with new relief road to more round off the shape of the town.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Janet Holden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 515

Comment There are few problems in the majority of the Waveney District with Lowestoft being the exception. Development that has been allowed has resulted in the old infrastructure being allowed to decay alongside rather basic new development. Regeneration of the old infrastructure and housing with new and imaginative uses would improve the fell of the area to a far greater extent that further tacky new developments.
Joseph Mason

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 626

Comment We must have new housing in Waveney. I support the proposal to concentrate this on Lowestoft and Beccles, but why not include Halesworth? This has a railway station, and railways will become increasingly important over the years.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section  Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID  1801

Comment  Kessingland is expected to accommodate some growth to address its needs. Indeed the village needs to accommodate a degree of growth in order to prosper. However this must be balanced against the need to preserve its role as a rural settlement which does not encroach unduly on the open countryside that surrounds it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Larkfleet Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seth Williams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section**  
Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

**Comment ID**  
2149

**Comment**  
* The development strategy should look to focus more growth than previous strategies at Beccles to ensure the deliverability of the strategy, for the benefit of the vitality of Beccles itself and to better respond to market demand.
* More significant growth at Beccles is appropriate to support its vitality and viability as a market town, to improve its infrastructure and public facilities, to provide a better housing mix to respond to market demand.
* More significant growth at Beccles would also support and complement the ongoing development of the Ellough Industrial Estate and Enterprise Zone and help to support and boost the rural economy.

We consider that a further option could be considered that would see a higher level of growth in Beccles (and Worlingham), with a corresponding reduction in Lowestoft. This would have the potential to offer the same qualitative benefits as set out above but on a greater scale.

However as this is a similar option to Option 2, we would suggest that as a minimum the Council expresses Option 2 as a range, of for example, that 25% to 35% of growth should be allocated to Beccles and Worlingham.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section  Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID  1063

Comment  The key consideration when identifying the approach to distributing development across the District is to ensure that development is focussed in sustainable locations, that are well connected to existing services and facilities, in accordance with the sustainable development objectives contained within the NPPF, such as our client's site at land south of Leisure Way, Lowestoft.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1237

Comment The key consideration when identifying the approach to distributing development across the District is to ensure that development is focussed in sustainable locations, that are well connected to existing services and facilities, in accordance with the sustainable development objectives contained within the NPPF, such as our client's site at Lothingland Hospital, Lowestoft.
Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 777

should be based on capability of infrastructure to cope with development. Beccles and Worlingham do not have the infrastructure to cope with 10% growth - so their figure needs to be lower if there is no investment in infrastructure.

moderate Development should be made in all the rural areas to enable young people/ oder generation to remain in their home village if they wish to

New development with all the associated infrastructure may be an appropriate way forward
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lynette Meen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mike Hennessey

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 564

Comment The Waveney Local plan seems good intentioned but I feel that these 'top down' approaches are generally not as productive or efficient as a 'bottom up' approach. Would it not be better to allow the market to decide the best solutions? I'm not advocating a completely laissez faire approach as some planning restriction should of course be in place to protect some areas; However I feel that the people who are best positioned to decide where development should occur are the people that will eventually live, work and play in these new developments. House builders will choose sites that they feel will produce the most demand. Demand is essentially a measure of desirability of a product; therefore in the case of house building demand is in essence a measure of where people would most like to live. Assuming that all the incentives are correct, i.e. regulations do not have unforeseen side effects to distort the incentives, then the market should be best placed to choose the best sites. There will of course be failures brought about by bad choices. But these will be minimised through the profit motive as bad choices lead to a loss of revenue and poor house builders going out of business. The good builders however will thrive by providing housing where people want to live.

So instead of choosing a plan why not open up all these sites to tender to as many house builders as possible. House builders should have to state the number and type of houses that they plan to build in the area they choose from those available and also state any extras they are willing to provide, i.e. playgrounds, help extended and/or improving schools or anything else that is socially beneficial that the market alone cannot provide under our current system. The planning department can then allow the most attractive bids to proceed.

Attempting to 'pick winners' is extremely difficult even for those that have the required information needed to try. Asking the public to 'pick winners' when very few of those asked will have the relevant knowledge or experience seems inappropriate to me.
B Harrild

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 173

Comment Areas of natural beauty are not suitable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Haycock</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The idea of a new settlement away from existing settlements is worth considering, particularly if it leads to a more resilient transport and road network, but the environmental cost would need detailed assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 653

Comment We should be using Brownfield sites first, before considering new Greenfield sites. Also, transport and flooding considerations should be implicit in awarding contracts to developers. Finally, new housing needs to be affordable: we should consider those most likely to need these new homes and avoid the "Hampstead on Sea" affect which is most prevalent in Southwold. We do not want to encourage Waveney to become a "second home" only location, where towns are dead during the "low season".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicky Elliott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

industrial development and job opportunities must come before more residential development
Robert Williamson

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 503

Comment most villages should have social houses built for the local youngsters not 4 bedroom mansions for retiring Londoners
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1002

Comment It needs to be considered where people are going to work, for example if Beccles is over expanded there is no easy and viable train link to Norwich, which has the most potential employment and the rush hour traffic is already extremely congested.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1282

Comment No. In particular we oppose Option 3 since increases in housing in Southwold and Reydon will not be the best way of meeting local need unless very carefully managed as up to half of new homes are likely to become second homes or holiday lets.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1915

Comment We are not in a position to comment on alternative scenarios other than urging that new homes should be built in close proximity to where jobs are located in order to cut down on car use and enhance a sense of connection to local communities. When people commute a significant distance for work each day, they tend to have less time to be engaged with their communities. As local authority services are cut, communities are increasingly reliant on volunteers.
**St John's Hall Farms**
Bidwells (John Long)

**Section**
Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

**Comment ID**
1381

**Comment**
If the Council's ambition is for Bungay to be a self-sustaining community (as far as it can be), it will need to have capacity to grow sustainably. It is St John's Hall Farms view that a more appropriate growth scenario would be around 8%(750) new homes.
This level of growth represents an annual figure of around 40 homes, which the housing market can bear and which would help meet local needs including affordable homes. St John's Hall Farms considers that sufficient land is / will be available over the plan period to accommodate this level of growth.
St John’s Hall Farms
Bidwells (John Long)

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1385

Comment St John’s Hall Farms consider that none of the options for the distribution of growth are best for Bungay. Each of the options considerably underplay the housing need and opportunities available for Bungay. Growth of between 2% and 4% represents a maximum of around 380 homes in the town over a 25-year period, which is only 15 new houses a year. The minimum figure could be as low as 150 units over the period, including housing which is already committed. A more appropriate distribution of growth should be around 8% of the total housing figure. This will help meet housing needs and will be a boost to the rest of the town. The town centre needs growth in the population to help it thrive and prosper. If the Council’s ambition is for Bungay to be as self-sufficient as possible (acknowledging that it will not meet all job, education, leisure etc. needs), then it will need sufficient capacity to grow. A figure of around 40 new homes per year over the plan period (750 in total) is more appropriate and is a figure which the local housing market can sustain, particularly as a proportion of this will be affordable homes. St John’s Hall Farms consider that there is not an unlimited capacity for new homes in Bungay, but there are sufficient sites that could reasonably come forward to accommodate a higher growth rate over the plan period.
Susan Harrison

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 2194

Comment Agricultural land around the villages i.e. greenfield sites.
The Slater Family
Bidwells (John Long)

Section Q08 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 2224

Comment In terms of the Spatial Options or Growth, the Slater Family considers that none of the options put forward allow Bungay to properly thrive and prosper. Bungay, like a lot of towns in Suffolk, needs investment in the local economy and needs to be an attractive place to live and to provide sufficient homes at affordable prices, which enable local people in Bungay to have access to appropriate housing.

The suggested spread of new homes to Bungay in each of the scenarios ranges from 2% to 4%. This equates to between approximately 150-380 new homes between 2011 and 2036. At the highest rate this is only 15 new homes per year over the period; and at the lower and only 6 dwellings per year furthermore, 150 of their homes have been permitted already. This level of growth is not enough to:

1. Meet the housing needs in Bungay, and
2. Ensure that Bungay thrives and prospers. More people living in the town will inevitably mean more people spending money in the town.

If the Council’s ambition is for Bungay to be a self-sustaining community (as far as possible), it will need to have capacity to grow sustainably. It is the Slater Family’s view that a more appropriate growth scenario would be around 8% (750) new homes. This level of growth represents an annual figure of around 40 homes, which the market can bear and which would help meet local needs including affordable homes. The Slater Family considers that their land to the rear of the High School will ensure that there is / will be available over the plan period to accommodate this level of growth.

The Slater Family considers that none of the options for the distribution of growth are best for Bungay. Each of the options considerably underplay the housing need and opportunities available for Bungay. Growth of between 2% and 4% represents a maximum of around 380 homes in the town over a 25-year period, which is only 15 new houses a year. The minimum figure could be as low as 150 units over the period, including housing which is already committed. A more appropriate distribution of growth should be around 8% of the total housing figure. This will help meet housing needs and will be a boost to the rest of the town. The town centre needs growth...
in the population to help it thrive and prosper. If the Councils ambition is for Bungay to be as selfsufficient as possible (acknowledging that it will not meet all job, education, leisure etc. needs), then it will need sufficient capacity to grow. A figure of around 40 homes per year over the plan period (750 in total) is more appropriate and is a figure which the local housing market can sustain, particularly as a proportion of this will be affordable homes. The Slater Family considers that their land to the rear of Bungay High School is a suitable development location and ensure the higher growth targets can be met.
Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adam Hook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alan Baguste

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 762

Comment Between Lowestoft and Beccles
Anonymous

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 290

Comment Brampton! Lound, Blundeston?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section

Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID

319

Comment

Lowestoft
Anonymous

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1577

Comment Possible land between Carlton Colville and Beccles.
Anonymous

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing Comment ID 1623

Comment Halesworth.
Anonymous

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1640

Comment In the Mutford area between Barnby and Gisleham. Build new link road to take away dangerous Barnby bends and have proper access with large roundabout to new town/settlement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B A Crockford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1995

Comment Whilst a new settlement would be a brave and interesting idea, the necessary upfront infrastructure costs and the likely take up (and achievable build) rates, almost certainly render this a non-starter.
Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 399

Comment I do not agree that a new settlement is appropriate in our area. It would have a far greater adverse impact than if the development was distributed sensibly. We are mainly a rural community and the creation of a new town would destroy that. There must be sufficient space in and adjacent to existing towns and villages to meet current requirements without further urbanisation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charles Fortt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Chris Morris**

**Section**  
Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

**Comment ID**  
1602

**Comment**  
Not necessary.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1793

Comment A new development to the South/West of the region between Bungay and Halesworth could be the answer as suitable infrastructure could be developed at the same time.
Daniela Goodall

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1326

Comment Somewhere that will not create more problems with access to Lowestoft with the 2 or 3 bridges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>David Burman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debbie Read

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 338

Comment Not on a flood plain, in an area where there is poor/no infrastructure or investment to help the chosen area cope with the extra pressure of occupation.
Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1055

Comment between Lowestoft and great yarmouth
Environment Agency

Section  Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID  2098

Comment  For any new settlements within Waveney District we would like these to positively improve the environment. We would welcome further early communication on this matter if and when sites have been given consideration. There should be a robust application of the National Planning Policy Framework’s Sequential and Exception Tests at the Local Plan level when considering site allocations for new strategic housing developments in the District.
Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis

**Section**

Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

**Comment ID**

1591

**Comment**

It should be where existing infrastructure could support growth or be expanded to support more growth, so it should be located around the main arteries around Lowestoft or near new ring roads.
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 361

Comment Between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth could work. There should be a reasonable chance for jobs. We would not favour between Lowestoft and Beccles as we could see Beccles losing its identity by becoming joined to Carlton Colville in due course.
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1345

Comment The Greater Norwich authorities have no preferred view on the growth options, but note that further growth in Beccles and Bungay will help in meeting some of the service needs of current and future South Norfolk residents in the Waveney valley. Allowing more growth in market towns may also help secure higher delivery of housing.

A new settlement might be considered, and if so, should be considered for potential beyond the end of the Plan period (i.e. for more than 2,000 homes), due to the high infrastructure costs associated with such a proposal, and the frequently long lead-in time for schemes such as these.
| Ian King |
|---|---|
| **Section** | Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing |
| **Comment ID** | 551 |
| **Comment** | North of Lowestoft towards Blundeston. |
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Between Lowestoft and Beccles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
James Toole

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 190

Comment Nowhere. Don’t spoil the green buffer between the urban sprawl of Lowestoft and Beccles.
John Bumpus

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 580

Comment A new settlement between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth is clearly the better option and no other option should be considered unless a third crossing is built. The option of between Lowestoft and Beccles is clearly unsustainable with existing road infrastructure and will blend the settlements together to the detriment of both. If the third crossing is built, then options to the south of Lowestoft on the A1" become more feasible.
John Eade

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 516

Comment Development is normally driven by some purpose. The industrial revolution developed areas that were rich in natural resources. As the need for and nature of this development appears aimless then the location for it is immaterial. If the aim of the development is to address the problems of the district then it would logically be located in and around Lowestoft.
John Ling

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1610

Comment I think best plan would be to create another town perhaps just north of Wrentham and to keep building in infill sites in local villages. This would help big builders like Persimmon etc. to have a big site to go at leaving smaller builders with work on fill in sites.
John Trew

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 16

Comment It would seem logical to site new, larger, developments on land very adjacent to existing main roads. Development, for example, around Beccles and Worlingham would only lead to more traffic congestion going into or through the town.
Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 2150

Comment Question 9 raises the issue of a new settlement. Whilst in principle the prospect of a new settlement is an option which has recently seen greater support from the Government and in national planning policy, it does not appear to be a viable or realistic proposition in this instance. It is apparent from the published 'Call for Sites' responses that no suitable site has been put forward for such a development. We consider that if there are no deliverable new settlements put forward then Option 4 is unrealistic and should not be further progressed. Continuing to assess this option would be contrary to the SA regulations and various guidance documents; in that it would not be a realistic alternative and furthermore the sustainability effects could not be appropriately identified and compared with other options.
Lynette Meen

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1630

Comment Between Lowestoft and GY on A12 or somewhere off A146.
Haycock

Section
Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID
885

Comment
A new settlement between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, or between Halesworth and Beccles (on the train route) might be sustainable options. In any event, I think there is a case for more of the development pressure on 'market towns' being borne by Halesworth.
Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID

988

Comment

Between Norwich and Diss with its own mainline station.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 654

Comment I'm not in favour of this option, but if this proves to be the most viable we really should ensure that proper transport links are part of this (i.e. that rail and bus options are favoured over merely car usage).
Nicky Elliott

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 722

Comment NOT between Beccles and Lowestoft. Prefer further south, between Halesworth and Southwold, between the railway line and the A145.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norman Castleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1666

Comment Any new settlement should be easily accessible from the main trunk roads A12 or A146
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 41

Comment Given that it would be unlikely to be near to current centres of employment then it should be on good transport links, and its location perhaps driven by the location of the expected increase in employment provision.
### Peter Cockerton and Karen Evans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We do not support the idea of a new settlement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peter Scott

**Section**
Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing 

**Comment ID** 397

**Comment** A new settlement between Yarmouth and Lowestoft would be preferable as it would give easier access to jobs in both towns and involve shorter commuting journeys. Development between Lowestoft and Beccles would create traffic congestions due to commuting and spoil a scenic rural area and has an unsuitable road system.
john norris

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 827

Comment a new settlement should not be considered
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1005

Comment Not between Lowestoft and Beccles but maybe between Diss and Bungay as Diss has excellent rail links to Norwich and London, where the employment is.
russell martin

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1362

Comment I am not in favour of a new settlement.
S T Blower

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 1574

Comment Bad idea and should not be contemplated. It would have too fundamental a change to build a new town in our area.
Sarah Cross

Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 135

Comment Southside (of Lowestoft), northside would be too close to Gorleston + Yarmouth.
Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 71

Comment There is a lot of Waveney south of Beccles
| Section | Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing |
| Comment ID | 1916 |
| Comment | Developing a new "garden" town could be an exciting option. Placing it close to a rail line with direct access to Norwich creates the option of using public transport in place of cars. If rail travel between Lowestoft and Norwich were faster and more frequent, this would also enhance the regeneration of Lowestoft. |
St James South Elmham Parish Meeting Mary Henry

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 805

Comment From our answer to Q1, it will be clear that we believe a major new settlement is inappropriate and unlikely to succeed given the lack of infrastructure (especially road, rail and high-speed broadband) anywhere in the district. We do not believe this will significantly improve over the timescale of the plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan Harrison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Terence White**

**Section**
Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

**Comment ID**
770

**Comment**
South of Lowestoft along the A12. Between Lowestoft, Southwold, Halesworth.
Terry McDonald

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 101

Comment It would be better to extend the boundaries of Lowestoft towards Blundeston, Sumerlayton and Beccles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Any new settlement would be to the detriment of the Market Towns and rural areas and dilute their importance in community life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wendy Summerfield

Section Q09 If we were to consider planning for a new settlement in the new Local Plan where should that settlement be located? Options could include somewhere between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, between Lowestoft and Beccles or somewhere else close to existing

Comment ID 271

Comment Any new development should be close to the infrastructure and jobs so the most sensible place for a new development would be near to Lowestoft/Great Yarmouth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?</td>
<td>Option 2. It's unclear how WDC can influence this. It is commercial viability that will drive Developers’ interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Andrew Nainby

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 961

Comment Option 2 - Lowestoft already gets the lion's share of employment opportunities and investment
Anonymous

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 291

Comment At a local level Lowestoft is a total pain to get in and out of. Most people here don't go there.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 327

Comment Lowestoft already has numerous leisure facilities and places such as Bungay and Halesworth could benefit greatly in areas such as gyms.
Anonymous

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1624

Comment Retail – Lowestoft; Leisure – Beccles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AP and AE Wolton

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1617

Comment Lowestoft.
Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 230

Comment With the current shops struggling do we need more.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B A Crockford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

**Section**

Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

**Comment ID**

1996

**Comment**

In the event that option 3 for the distribution of housing development is chosen then option 2 for the distribution of retailing should follow as a means of providing for the expansion of the market towns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>New retail and leisure facilities should be located within the plots proposed for large housing developments. The traffic from these large housing estates should not be encouraged to regularly access adjoining town centres for their daily shopping, leisure or health needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

* OPTION 2 SEEMS BEST
* CENTRALISING EVERYTHING IN LOWESTOFT SEEMS PRESCRIPTIVE AND FORCES PEOPLE TO TRAVEL.
* UNLESS GOVERNMENT IS GOING TO BUILD IT WILL BE DOWN TO INVESTORS TO DECIDE IF THERE IS A MARKET IN THEIR AREA. IF SOMEBODY IS PREPARED TO INVEST IN AN AREA AND PROVIDE LOCAL EMPLOYMENT IT SHOULD BE LOOKED ON FAVOURABLY.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Option 2. Retail development should not be focused only out of town as it will only mean that more and more people don't go into town centres. It's important to have decent shops in the towns and not only large retail centres with big car parks. This is particularly important in Lowestoft since it is such a pain to drive into the town, but very easy to drive to the retail parks. The old High Street and Kirkley High Street have a number of empty shops which could become thriving businesses if fewer people drive out of town to shop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1085

Comment Option 2
This gives more opportunity for people to go out and about and benefits tourism.
Within Lowestoft make more use of the brownfield sites beside the river eg old Boulton and Paul and areas of the old town eg old Town Hall
**chris Morris**

**Section**  Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

**Comment ID**  1603

**Comment**  Around Lake Lothing.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section  
Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  1794

Comment  
A more detailed look is required.
Councillor Sonia Barker

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1318

Comment As the main growth (for work and housing) will be within the Lowestoft environs then it follows that the new retail spaces should also be in Lowestoft or at the newly planned retail space (plus) at the old Zephar Cams site. Planning too should be aware of the online retail which increasingly is taking footfall away from the town centre. A concern would be that it draws a lot of footfall away from the town which could mean that Lowestoft lose stores as a result. A balance has to be struck here.
CTC John Thompson

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 164

Comment I would suggest option 2 as it seems to go with encouraging less car use. Some might feel that putting everything in Lowestoft thus bringing more people to spend money would be good for the town’s economy but not ultimately if it is bring far more cars in
David Burman

Section
Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID
632

Comment
In the major towns where they will be viable.
Didy Ward

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 117

Comment Option 1. The market towns are unique in that they comprise primarily of small independent businesses and retail which makes visiting them attractive. I would not like to see our market towns as targets for chain stores, whether that be food or other. More should be done to help promote the market towns as sources of locally grown and produced food.
Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1056

Comment option 1 Focus all new retail and leisure development in Lowestoft
Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1592

Comment These should be expansions of existing areas ie. around Lowestoft/Lake Lothing
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1346

Comment The Greater Norwich authorities have a slight preference for option 2, which would help smaller settlements become more sustainable, although the "market" will decide whether this is appropriate, and the distribution will need to be closely linked to the chosen housing growth distribution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ian King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Toole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>In Lowestoft, but equally the market towns need their fair share. In particular traders other than in Lowestoft also need increased footfall to survive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jeffrey Harris

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 303

Comment Lowestoft is a sad but weary town deserving better. It needs to be refreshed as a retail centre and with increased leisure facilities. It is an ideal holiday resort, with a wonderful beach front and lots of good walks etc in the area. It needs a boost and this will improve job opportunities and bring the old town back to life and an attractive town for visitors and those living in the surrounding area.
John Bumpus

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 579

Comment Option 1 is the only sustainable option with the necessary infrastructure support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Bumpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joanna Barfield

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 238

Comment Consider the lack of infrastructure in Halesworth.
John Eade

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 517

Comment The current retail provision appears to supply the needs of the current population adequately. The proximity of Norwich appears to rule out the area becoming a shopping destination. Any further retail growth should follow any growth and retailers will be the best guide.
Section | Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID | 2151

Comment | Option 1 would appear an unsustainable approach which would fail adequately to meet the needs of the wider area and address the existing shortcomings. Such an approach would serve to continue to constrain the market towns from adequately performing their function as service centres to the rural area. The focus of services and facilities at Lowestoft would not be readily accessible to many in the District given the geographical location and would not serve to encourage sustainable modes of transport for many.

Option 2 provides a more appropriate option which would enable the market towns to better serve the rural areas and would benefit both the rural economy and the vitality and viability of these market towns as a result. This would reduce the need to travel by car for day-to-day needs. Whilst a more widely dispersed approach may also be considered an option, it is considered that a hierarchical approach with focus on key settlements is appropriate in order to ensure the scale of development is both sustainable and viable.
Lynette Meen

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1632

Comment On A146.
B Harrild

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 172

Comment Lowestoft.
Haycock

Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 886

Comment Option 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McGregor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 655

Comment Based on my choice for housing and jobs development (i.e. Scenario 3), I think Option 2 makes the most sense.
Nicky Elliott

Section  Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  723

Comment  Option 2
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1175

Comment Concentrate on the town centre
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Town centres regeneration first</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1667

Comment Option 2 is preferred
Development should be where there is proven need to serve a residential area.
Any development should be easily accessible from main roads.
Adequate parking facilities must be provided to prevent the problems experienced at the Water Lane leisure centre in Lowestoft, where parking is grossly inadequate.
Pamela Cyprien

Section  
Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  
1258

Comment  
Option 1.
Pamela Morris

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 559

Comment Lowestoft.
Jonathan Blankley

Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 42

Comment
I would slightly favour option 2 as long as the development was such that within Beccles it catered for the South and East side of the town. It should be of a size that compliments the existing town centre, providing a smaller alternative food retail outlet/s, such as an Aldi or Lidl type, some leisure options (both food/drink and other), and non-food retail that doesn't directly conflict with the existing town centre. The existing centre lacks the capacity to significantly expand should demand increase, so perhaps a park and ride option linking any new centre to the town centre would benefit both.
Peter Cockerton and Karen Evans

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1584

Comment Mostly at Beccles and Lowestoft Leisure facilities are needed at the small towns (Bungay, Halesworth, Southwold).
Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 828

Comment option 1
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 608

Comment Option 1 is best - we need to support local independent traders in the market towns and enhance the appropriate tourist offer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sarah cross</th>
<th>section</th>
<th>Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comment ID</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>All over shops are closing why? No parking close enough, rents too high?? Why won't large names come here?? Traffic problems or A12?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1917

Comment Southwold does not need more new food store development and has sufficient space for other retail uses. (The Kings Head has permission for 3 retail units – it has not been sold; and the Fat Face building will be redeveloped with another three units.)
St James South Elmham Parish Meeting Mary Henry

Section  Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  806

Comment  With the major social and cultural shift to on-line shopping it is difficult to see the need for any large-scale retail developments. The future success of retail outlets will depend on their quality and service and investment should seek to reinforce this approach in existing towns and high streets. Leisure development in such a rural area (excepting two coastal resorts) should be sensitively controlled and directed to the enjoyment of natural facilities and environment.
St John's Hall Farms  
Bidwells (John Long)

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1386

Comment St John's Hall Farms agrees with the Council that new retail development should be allowed to come forward in the market towns as suggested in Option 2. Primarily the focus should be the town centres, and then for certain types of stores, a sequential test should be applied, as the capacity to accommodate larger supermarkets in town centres is limited. In certain town stores of a certain size will need to be located outside of town centres.
Stephen Read

Section  Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  248

Comment  Smaller units and leisure across the community.
Terence White

Section  Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID  771

Comment  Option 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Terry McDonald</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section Q10 Which option for the distribution of new retail development presented do you think is the best?

Comment ID 1523

Comment We would support the promotion of modest levels of development in all town centres relative to their size with a new food store and leisure facilities developed in Halesworth. Halesworth is the 'hub' for surrounding villages where main retail leisure and housing should be located. This style of development should be spread more evenly across market towns to support rural areas.
Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Anonymous

Section Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 153

Comment Market towns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christopher Sadler

Section Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 768

Comment Waveney District Council is trying to maximise revenue within the government austerity programme and so this runs contrary to retail development eg. car parking charges have led me to decrease the frequency of my visits to Halesworth and store/plan visits to Norwich instead
Debbie Read

Section | Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID | 339

Comment | Relevant to the needs of the community and the plans for the future.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jeffrey Harris

Section  Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID  304

Comment  Poor old Bungay has virtually no major food shop, only the Co-op out of town and neither has almost forgotten Halesworth, a one street town. Both need life being breathed into them, they are slowly sinking into the slough of despond. They need imaginative developments.
Haycock

Section

Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 887

Comment No views.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 656

Comment Decent transport links are a must. Also, we should be encouraging long-term sustainability of all new developments. Finally, we need to consider closely the mix of developments: some areas have few fresh-food options or things like ironmongers and/or other "practical" retailers. As for leisure: it would be nice to see more than just pubs and bars being promoted as "leisure" locations. Not everyone cares about drinking....
Norman Castleton

Section Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 416

Comment Build high in population centres which will do away with suburban sprawl and its awful dreariness (witness the Belton area) and it will save our precious countryside.
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across
the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 43

Comment Yes, look at the actual needs of each market town, and how they will
change over the next 25 years and base the plans on that.
John Norris

Section Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 829

Comment leisure development between Lowestoft and Yarmouth to include a new cinema
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>russell martin</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 1918

Comment It is vital to put new retail development into town centres and leisure development as close to town centres as possible in order to increase town centre vitality, and discourage car use.
Susan Harrison

Section Q11 Are there any other approaches to distributing development across the District that we should consider?

Comment ID 2192

Comment Is there really a need for more retail developments Lowestoft and Beccles are well served. Leisure developments can be added to those already in place around Bungay Beccles and Halesworth.
Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Andrew Nainby

Section Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID 962

Comment southern edge of Beccles
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID 1998

Comment There are significant area of unused land on both Peto Road and Commercial Road which provide opportunities for commercial development, in addition to a lot of unused railway land, I am aware of the flood risk issues, but subject to satisfactory resolution of these development should be concentrated in these areas. They form a gateway to the town and in the case of Peto Road a link to the retail Park. In addition the existing car park on Clapham Road South is an underused resource. This could be redeveloped to include parking within the scheme as there are already good links to the high street through the Britten Centre.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The empty town centre retail plots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID 1795

Comment No not in Beccles
Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section  Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID  1532

Comment  Halesworth is a hub for the surrounding parishes. The retail facilities here are heavily used. There is the potential for another supermarket on the Town Centre site. This has been an on going situation for years. HTC is aware that there is now serious interest in the site but there is no hard information. This would increase footfall in Halesworth and serve a large rural population. At the same time similar development in the market towns can only add to the vibrancy of these important areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Not that we know of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Holden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No, the council should do all it can to protect and nurture town centres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jeffrey Harris

Section Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID 305

Comment As stated the smaller towns have very few features in this area of stores and basic facilities such a petrol stations. Bungay, Halesworth and even Southwold are bereft of normal such facilities. Where does one buy petrol in Southwold, food in Bungay and Halesworth?
Section Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID 582

Comment No. Out of town developments should be severely constrained to preserve traditional centres. These already have empty shops and too many charity shops and further decline would be encouraged by out of town developments.
Julian Rogers

Section Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID 508

Comment Clearly, the whole of the Waterfront area of Lake Lothing should be considered for prime retail and leisure and housing growth. Waterside living affords a premium throughout the UK. An integrated strategy that links the superb south Lowestoft beach with housing/leisure/retail around/on Lake Lothing and then through to the wider environmental/natural Broads area would create a significant differentiator for Lowestoft in particular.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>In respect of potential sites for retail development, Larkfleet's proposed development to the south east of Beccles would provide an opportunity for a local convenience retail offering. This would serve to address the 'relatively weak convenience offer in terms of unit numbers' identified in the Retail Needs Assessment. It would also be well-located in terms of offering an option to the south of the town (whereas the existing 'out of town' retail offer is located to the north side) thereby improving accessibility to convenience shopping to both the southern part of the town and the wider surrounding rural area, particularly having regard to the increased wider accessibility to the site offered by the forthcoming Beccles Southern Relief Road and the proximity of existing and allocated employment areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haycock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>No views.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section  Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID  990

Comment  Loaves and fishes at beccles marina
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Nicky Elliott**

**Section**  Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

**Comment ID**  724

**Comment**  Beccles Town Centre site 16 for indoor sports facilities.
Norman Castleton

Section Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID 415

Comment Most physical retail areas within and on the edge of populations centres are already struggling. There have been closures therefore to think in terms of expanding retail and leisure areas on top of already existing developments and plans is not very realistic.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID 1919

Comment

Southwold's single most important "leisure" use is our library, which in 2015 alone held 327 events that were educational, cultural, and for entertainment. Over 90% of approximately 250 questioned about the future use of Southwold Hospital said that they would like to see the library (which is losing its lease at the end of 2017) located there. Another 41% would like to see the Hospital Site used as an Innovation Centre to encourage new businesses. The Chamber of Trade strongly advocates that the Southwold Hospital site be used as a community hub and business centre because this will increase year-round footfall into the town centre. Many shops are border-line sustainable due to the loss of year-round population. We urge that the Southwold Hospital site be allocated a mixed use class that supports the community's vision for Southwold's future.

As to other potential leisure uses in Southwold, the 2009 Core Strategy highlighted visitor pressure as a Southwold sustainability issue. Since then visitor pressure has grown substantially to the point that many visitors in the high season report that the town's is losing its attractiveness and character. There are not enough conveniently located parking facilities; the crush of people on the High Street's pavements forces people to walk in the road, which is also the main artery into the town. The town's ability to provide adequate rubbish bins, litter collection, toilets, etc. and repair other wear and tear on the town is strained (each of these is infrastructure related).
Terry McDonald

Section  Q12 Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail and leisure development?

Comment ID  103

Comment  Lake Lothing, along Waveney Drive.
Kirkly shops along London Road South
Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities for development

b) If we prioritise development based on services and facilities provision, what services and facilities do you think are the most important for a community to have so it could accommodate further development?

Andy House

Section
Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 638

Comment
It says that all proposed sites won’t be built on but there seems to be little sensitivity about integrating new build into the villages. Instead of infilling in the traditional sense many sites appear to be of estate size which would be a vast increase of population to the existing villages.

I know people need new homes but there appears to be no thought for food production or the environment. We are after all an island and surely it is madness to concrete it all with houses and roads adding to the problems of pollution, flooding etc.

I understand that at Brampton and Stoven’s PC an offer (at the WDC’s suggestion) was proposed to build a new village hall, bowling green and car park opposite the school and build twelve semi-detached houses on the old site which, I believe, was accepted and seems a reasonable idea. Will you please clarify this as it isn’t on the Local Plan map?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | It is our view that all four measures outlined above should be considered when selecting appropriate villages for development. As noted in our response to Q07, the NPPF seeks to support sustainable growth across the rural area and thus is not considered appropriate that a single option should be prioritised.  
We consider that the requirement for a settlement to contain services and facilities in order to accommodate development is inflexible and introduces a 'tick box' approach which does not take account of the individual role a settlement may play in the local community. In accordance with paragraph 55 of the NPPF, "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby." |
Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 1999

Comment Q13-15 Perhaps the answer here is to have a village hierarchy which allows groups of up to 25 in the larger – service – villages, which as minimum should have a shop and/or a school, with small groups of no more than 5 in the lower order villages and with some village limits defined to prevent unnecessary sprawl, but not drawn so tightly as to kill the possibility of any new housing taking place. Without new housing the sustainability of villages is further undermined.

Village housing is a sensitive issue and any criteria for development should also include a need to have proper regard to the character setting.
Benacre Estates Company Edward Vere Nicoll
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section

Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 1528

Comment

It is our view that all four measures outlined above should be considered when selecting appropriate villages for development. As noted in our response to Q07, the NPPF seeks to support sustainable growth across the rural area and thus is not considered appropriate that a single option should be prioritised.

We consider that the requirement for a settlement to contain services and facilities in order to accommodate development is inflexible and introduces a 'tick box' approach which does not take account of the individual role a settlement may play in the local community. In accordance with paragraph 55 of the NPPF, "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."
brian may

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 259

Comment I BELIEVE IT IS HIGHLY UNLIKELY THAT SMALLER VILLAGES WILL EVER BECOME SELF SUFFICIENT IN SERVICES AGAIN SO IT WOULD BE BEST TO PRIORITISE DEVELOPMENT IN VILLAGES WHICH ARE NEAR TOWNS WHICH ALREADY HAVE SERVICES.

IF THE VILLAGE AND TOWN WERE LINKED BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT EVEN BETTER.

AGAIN WHO IS TO FUND THIS BUILDING? IF LOCALS WERE PREPARED TO FUND AND SELF BUILD HOUSES FOR THEMSELVES THIS SHOULD BE LOOKED ON FAVOURABLY.
 Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 1087

Comment Spread it throughout the areas that communities wish to have it in
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 1797

Comment We must not swamp any area without first making sure we have plans in place for adequate essential infrastructure eg health, schools, local shops, roads, leisure
Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming

Section  Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID  2089

Comment  Rural Housing
The Government’s plan for rural areas set out in the ‘Towards a one nation economy: a 10-point plan for boosting productivity in rural areas’ document highlights, that a lack of housing is a national challenge but in rural areas it is a particular constraint to both labour and entrepreneurial mobility, with the stock of housing limited relative to demand and higher average house prices than in urban areas. This is further evidence of the Government’s will to increase rural housing availability through development so as not to stifle rural economic growth.
All settlements including those located in rural areas have a pivotal role to play in ensuring that the housing needs of the district will be delivered and meaningful growth should therefore be directed to these locations to meet local housing needs and improve affordability in these areas.
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 1347

Comment Whilst development should probably be prioritised to better-serviced villages, allowing some development in the smallest villages and hamlets may help increase the overall rate of delivery of houses through greater choice and competition.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 1707

Comment a) i) the best provision of services and facilities
Janet Holden

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 85

Comment Regular and reliable public transport. Roads where cars can pass each other. Roads with pavements for pedestrians. Street lighting, superfast broadband, schools and doctors within a 10 minute journey. Shops within a short distance. A village pub and services such as libraries
Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 306

Comment Several of our smaller villages and hamlets are inhabited by older citizens often not well served by local transport. There is an obvious need for some form of vitalization in low cost housing for local youngsters and basic facilities like village scale shops and low cost leisure facilities. I know many older inhabitants feel cut off and are aware of the lack of facilities but do not want to leave their long time homes.
John Bumpus

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 583

Comment a) Development should go to villages with the most services and facilities.
b) The most important of these are health, transport (including roads), schools, drainage and community facilities. Many of the villages listed may not have these any more!

Affordable housing should be provided in Lowestoft and the market Towns, which should have existing adequate service provision. If development goes ahead in villages, it should be tightly linked to the provision of the necessary services and facilities and should not be approved without guarantees.
John Eade

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 518

Comment a) Development should follow the ability of the village to support the growth allowed. Simply developing housing, for example, will lead to a decline in the area. The development needs to allow the community to produce income.

b) The facilities required also need to reflect the development. Education and health would appear to be the greatest priorities but the mix would depend on whether the development was for working people or a retirement destination.
John Trew

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 17

Comment b) Local shop and local pub/village hall.
Lesley Beevor

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 778

Comment a) i) B) doctors dentists primary and secondary school
Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 2067

Comment Development in villages should be prioritised in the areas that have the greatest housing need, provide the best opportunities for development. The Options for the new Waveney Local Plan recognises that 'the rural parts of Waveney are characterised by small villages and dispersed settlements'. It acknowledges that 'Housing in rural areas is becoming increasingly unaffordable to families and young people. This affects the mix of people living in these areas with more people leaving to find affordable accommodation elsewhere'. The Council states that 'This could adversely affect longstanding family and social connections and undermine the identities of settlements' and that 'An aging population in rural areas can also create unbalanced communities which affect the provision of services, facilities, employment and housing'. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haycock</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>No views.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section
Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 658

Comment
a) Yes
b) Transport links; day-to-day shopping options (food, practical services, some clothing); medical/care support; education and/or options for young people (otherwise, these will become geriatric ghettos).
Norman Castleton

Section Q13  a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 417

Comment Surely, the problem is that the public and private services that any population needs are already stretched through lack of funds. You will struggle to maintain things as they are and to think in terms of expansion based on non-existent funds is nonsense.
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Employment first or there will be more commuting which is not a sustainable option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Good quality employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rebecca Brough

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 640

Comment More infill in villages to rejuvenate.
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 609

Comment I think things like doctors surgeries, dentists, schools, drainage, flood risk, sports and social infrastructure are important but also internet is very important. I think we also need to look at groupings of smaller villages to allow development as otherwise they will die. Eg a bus route can’t run where there are few people for example. Also we don’t want to overheat the market towns as it will destroy their character.
Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 73

Comment yes, but some villages need development to maintain existing services and to potentially gain new facilities etc
Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 2125

Comment In order to foster sustainable rural development it is crucial to focus development in villages which have the best provision of services and facilities. This will align the plan with national policy and guidance on supporting rural communities. It is however important for the local planning authority to be mindful of avoiding 'blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding'.

The Waveney Profiles are the best starting point for directing housing to villages with the best provision of services and facilities. Settlements such as Somerleyton which have a 'full suite' of key facilities are an increasingly rare asset in rural areas and should be the primary focus. Settlements with a good selection of facilities should still be allowed to grow organically and proportionately. Settlements such as Ilketshall or Sotterley with little or no facilities may struggle to justify any development. But it will be the case that development in villages such as Somerleyton, which sustains the existing local facilities, will benefit other smaller or less well provisioned villages nearby.
Sotterley Estate Tom Barne  
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 2135

Comment In order to foster sustainable rural development it is crucial to focus development in villages which still retain a good provision of services and facilities. This will align the plan with national policy and guidance on supporting rural communities. It is important for the local planning authority to be mindful of avoiding ‘blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding’.

The Waveney Village Profiles are the best starting point for directing housing to villages which retain good provision of services and facilities. Settlements such as Willingham/Shadingfield1 which have a good range of key facilities which need support. Settlements such as Willingham/Shadingfield with a good selection of facilities should be allowed to grow organically and proportionately. Settlements such as Ilketshall or Shipmeadow with little or no facilities may struggle to justify any development. It will be the case that development in villages such as Willingham/Shadingfield, which sustains the existing local facilities, will benefit other smaller unprovisioned settlements nearby.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong> 1283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** a) Development in villages should occur where there is community support/ambition and the greatest housing need.  
b) Infrastructure provision and facilities such as local shops and adequate public transport are essential to create sustainable and viable communities. |
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q13 a) Should we prioritise development in villages which have i) the best provision of services and facilities (or accessibility to services and facilities) ii) the greatest housing need iii) community ambitions for more growth iv) the best opportunities

Comment ID 1920

Comment Development should be concentrated around market towns. Waveney’s villages are a source of beauty and the district’s character. Modest development is advocated in the form of in-fill where the design responds sympathetically to the distinctive village character and landscape and is within with village boundaries with the exception of affordable housing. Development should not take the form of a suburb that is not integrated into the character of the town and landscape. It should be linked to the town centre through safe and visually pleasant cycling and walking routes that encourage non-car use of town centre facilities, and be accompanied by a greatly improved and therefore adequate infrastructure. If new open space is created, its location, design and landscaping should invite people to use it, and feel ownership of it. Good examples of what not to do are the Persimmon development next to Carlton Hall in Carlton Colville and the development in Saxmundham adjacent the A12.
Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

brian may

Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 260

Comment GETTING ANYONE TO INVEST IS BECOMING INCREASINGLY DIFFICULT SO IT WOULD SEEM A SENSIBLE APPROACH WOULD BE TO CONSIDER DEVELOPMENTS IN A CASE BY CASE METHOD RATHER THAN JUST SIMPLY SAYING PLAN SAYS NO.
### Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All villages should have some development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Norman Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G Golding

Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 90

Comment Growth should be where there are better facilities, development should be restricted to a small number of larger villages/towns with better infrastructure and sustainable facilities. If concentration of leisure facilities is centre on Lowestoft, then it makes sense to develop the villages closest to Lowestoft to reduce the traffic on the roads and associated pollution.
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 1348

Comment Whilst development should probably be prioritised to better-serviced villages, allowing some development in the smallest villages and hamlets may help increase the overall rate of delivery of houses through greater choice and competition.
| Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring |
|---|---|
| **Section** | Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development? |
| **Comment ID** | 1708 |
| **Comment** | Minimise rural development and limit it to the 'larger villages' |
Janet Holden

Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 83

Comment All rural areas need some development but need to take into account transport and availability of services. At the same time development in rural areas shouldn't look like suburbs transplanted into rural areas. Also the rural development should be affordable for local people and should include a larger proportion of social housing for rent
John Bumpus

Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 584

Comment Development should be limited to villages with the necessary facilities and service provision and not defined by size. To develop where there is no public transport or local school, for example, is completely unsustainable.
John Trew

Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 18

Comment I see no harm in most, if not all, villages having some development - in fact it could re-envigorate some villages.
Lesley Beevor

Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 779

Comment all to receive some - to aid families who wish to remain
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Louis Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 2068

Comment Development in rural areas should not be limited to a small number of villages. A small quantity of residential development should be permitted in all villages if it meets local demand, helps to preserve local facilities and amenities and contributes to meeting Waveney and the wider East Suffolk District’s housing needs. However, it is proposed that the distribution of development should be focused in the larger more sustainable large villages identified in the existing Local Plan such as Corton.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Haycock</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McGregor

Section
Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID
991

Comment
Most villages need development so young people and families can survive and flourish in their communities. A pub is central and essential and would bring tourist money to the area as many people walk or cycle in these counties.
**Stepien**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Dear Sirs,  
I firmly believe that development in hamlets should not be given the go ahead, these hamlets are part of our national heritage, and they should be preserved the way that they have been for the countless number of past years. The infrastructure in these idyllic hamlets is unable to cope with the strains that this new century presents, not forgetting the destruction to the wildlife habitats of the numerous animals that live around these hamlets such as the Barn Owl and Badger, just to name two that live on the land where future housing is being proposed in Black Street Gisleham.  
I agree that there is a need for more housing to be built, but looking at the plan, it seems that not a lot of thought has gone into some of the areas that have been submitted and chosen, as potential developers are only interested in how much profit can be made from the land, without much thought for the consequences to the wildlife habitat or the people that live there.  
Yours sincerely  
Peter Stepien. |
Anne McClarnon

Section  Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID  659

Comment  It should be sited where there is most need. I don't think that all hamlets and villages will warrant growth.
### Jonathan Blankley

**Section**  
Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

**Comment ID**  
44

**Comment**  
Make the development of villages and hamlets proportionate to their existing size, and base the size of the houses built on the needs of the individual places.
Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 831

Comment limit village expansion
Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 75

Comment a top down blanket restriction on development in rural areas would only result community assets closing and the younger generations being forced out of the villages, through unaffordable house prices
Somerleyton Estate Lord Somerleyton
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 2126

Comment The local planning authority will need to be cautious about the use of blanket policies as set put in the NPPG.
In order to respond to national planning policy and guidance on rural housing which has emerged since the 2009 Waveney LDF it will be necessary for the local planning authority to cast their net wider than before. It may be necessary for Waveney to review the group of 'larger villages' to include more settlements within it or introduce a new category of smaller village to allow villages with an existing range of key facilities an opportunity growth proportionately and safeguard their remaining facilities. As set out above the village profiles will be the best starting point for reconsidering the villages in the rural area that can support growth. The local planning authority could consider grouping the rural villages and settlements into three classifications (as opposed to the two used currently; 'larger villages' and the 'countryside'). Note that in other Suffolk authorities these are called different things such as Core (1) and Hinterland (2) villages and the countryside (3) or Key Service Centres (1), Local Service Centres (2) and the countryside (3). We suggest the following format for these classifications:

* Well provisioned (1) – a full suite or near full suite of key facilities = a higher proportionate amount of growth
* Part provisioned (2) – a range of key facilities is available = a lower proportionate amount of growth
* Little or no provision (3) – little or no key facilities are available = evidence may support no growth

We have reviewed the 'larger' and other villages in the Waveney village profiles. The following table provides a distribution of the well provisioned, part provisioned and unprovisioned rural settlements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision of key facilities</th>
<th>&lt; Sustainable rural settlements &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well provisioned (1)</td>
<td>Corton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|able to facilitate growth, well provisioned Corton|
Holton
Kessingland
Somerleyton, Ashby and Herringfleet
Wangford with Henham
Wrentham
Blundeston
Part provisioned
Barnby
Brampton with Stoven
Flixton
Gisleham
Lound
North Cove
Ringsfield
Rumburgh
Willingham St. Mary with Shadingfield
Spexhall
Westhall
Wissett
< Unsustainable rural settlements >
Little or no provision
All Saints and the Elthams
Barsham
Benacre, Covehithe and South Cove
Blyford and Sotherton
Frostenden
Henstead with Hulver Street and Rushmere
Homersfield
Ilketshall St. Andrew
Ilketshall St. Lawrence
Ilketshall St. Margaret and Ilketshall St. John
Mettingham
Mutford
Redisham
Shipmeadow
Sotterley
St. Cross, South Eltham and St. Margaret
St. James South Eltham
Uggeshall
Weston and Ellough
Section Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?

Comment ID 2136

Comment The local planning authority will need to be cautious about the use of blanket policies as set out in the NPPG. In order to respond to national planning policy and guidance on rural housing which has emerged since the 2009 Waveney LDF it will be necessary for the local planning authority to cast their net wider than before. It will be necessary for Waveney to increase the number of 'larger villages' and/or introduce a new category of smaller village to allow villages with a good range of existing key facilities an opportunity growth proportionately and safeguard their retention. As set out above the village profiles will be the best starting point for reconsidering the villages in the rural area that can support growth. The local planning authority could consider grouping the rural villages and settlements into three classifications:

- Well provisioned – a full suite or near full suite of key facilities = a higher proportionate amount of growth
- Part provisioned – a range of key facilities is available = a lower proportionate amount of growth
- Little or no provision – little or no key facilities are available = evidence may support no growth

In other Suffolk authorities these are categorised as Core and Hinterland villages and the countryside or Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and the countryside.

We have reviewed the larger and other villages in the Waveney village profiles. The following table provides a distribution of the well provisioned, part provisioned and un provisioned settlements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision of key facilities (food shop, public house, primary school, post office and/or meeting place)</th>
<th>Able to facilitate growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well provisioned</td>
<td>Blundeston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corton</td>
<td>Holton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Sotterley Estate Tom Barne**  
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)
Kessingland
Somerleyton, Ashby and Herringfleet
Wangford with Henham
Wrentham
Part provisioned
Barnby
Brampton with Stoven
Flixton
Gisleham
Lound
North Cove
Ringsfield
Rumburgh
Willingham St. Mary with Shadingfield
Spexhall
Westhall
Wissett
< Unsustainable rural settlements >
Little or no provision
All Saints and the Elthams
Barsham
Benacre, Covehithe and South Cove
Blyford and Sotherton
Frostenden
Henstead with Hulver Street and Rushmere
Homersfield
Ilketshall St. Andrew
Ilketshall St. Lawrence
Ilketshall St. Margaret and Ilketshall St. John
Mettingham
Mutford
Redisham
Shipmeadow
Sotterley
St. Cross, South Eltham and St. Margaret
St. James South Eltham
Uggeshall
Weston and Ellough
**Wellington Construction Ltd**  
Paul Pitcher  
**MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q14 Should we limit development in rural areas to a small number of villages or ensure all villages and hamlets receive some development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>To ignore other rural villages could lead to decline over time therefore more latitude generally would be beneficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Alison Begley

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 803

Comment With reference to the suggestions under consideration for Blundeston, I would like to make the following comments:

Loss of rural area:
Blundeston was originally a small village supporting a number of shops and businesses. As the number of houses have increased over the years it has almost become a suburb of Lowestoft, gradually eroding a rural area. It is vital that this growth does not continue to grow too far or no rural areas will be left which will be harmful to physical, emotional and mental health.

Noise pollution has increased considerably since the opening of the new link road and is bound to worsen with more dwellings and vehicles.

Lack of infrastructure:
There is not the infrastructure to support an increase as there are no shops, other than a hairdressers, in the village. Since the closure of the prison there is little local employment, so many residents have to commute and the introduction of more people in the village will add to traffic and pollution as more people have to travel outside the area.
There is one primary school which is already full and no senior school. There are already buses having to pick up children who are still at school or college; it cannot be practical or economically viable to increase the number of pupils living in this area.
There is no GP or dentist in the village. It is already a case of waiting a month for an appointment with a GP at Bridge Road surgery, the local one for residents of Blundeston, and this will only worsen with additional patients signing onto the register there.

Roads:
With the local farms which are so important to the local economy, large farm machinery have to move to different fields, using narrow country
roads. There are also a large number of horse riders and cyclists who use the same roads.

Since the closure of Blundeston prison there is little employment available in the village so already many of us have to use our cars to commute to our work. The amount of traffic would increase proportionately to the number of new houses and their occupants.

Parking outside the primary school already poses safety risks and will not be improved if extra pupils start to attend the school.

Blundeston Prison Site
This has already been bought by a local developer and it is anticipated that requests for using parts of this site as community assets, eg the sports facilities for local people; use of the workshops for small businesses to encourage economic growth in the village; space for allotments on the previous farm will be ignored and housing built there. If this is the case then this should be the total amount of expansion in Blundeston under the Waveney Local Plan.
Anonymous

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 155

Comment Those which support local primary school catchment areas or struggling pubs, village halls, churches etc. Small scale but spread out.
Anonymous

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 292

Comment Not sure any of them do.
Anonymous

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 315

Comment All could accommodate a little but not very much as it changes the nature of the place.
Anonymous

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 321

Comment None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1625

Comment All smaller parishes to enable local families / young people to purchase homes.
Anthony Bridgland

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1473

Comment I received a letter recently concerning proposed development in Blundeston. I am very concerned by the numbers of houses proposed. Blundeston is a small village in a rural location with limited facilities and amenities. It would be wrong to develop the village in the way proposed. I am not against small increases in housing but feel any development must wait until the prison site is developed to assess the impact this increase in housing will have on the village.
**Anthony Light**

**Section**  
Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

**Comment ID**  
1646

**Comment**  
Development of Blundeston Prison site is sufficient for the village. Further development will have a big impact on wildlife including birds. Site 129 has previously been refused planning permission. Negative impact on the environment by additional cars needed to access work and shops outside of the village. Children have to walk to school using the roads as there are limited footpaths. Development of this scale as shown on the map will turn the village into a town.
AR Hall & Sons
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section
Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1485

Comment
The village of Reydon plays an important role in servicing its local community and thus is considered to be an appropriate and sustainable location for new housing development over the plan period. The village is situated to the west of the key settlement of Southwold, and approximately 12.9 miles to the south of Lowestoft. The settlement is strategically located to the east of the A12, which connects it with Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth to the north, and Ipswich to the south. The village has a range of local services and facilities which include; several shops, primary and secondary educational establishments and a range of leisure facilities. The village is well served by numerous daily bus services, which provide public transport links to key and market towns including; Lowestoft, Beccles, Halesworth and the city of Norwich.

With reference to existing local planning policy, Waveney’s previous Core Strategy, adopted in January 2009, incorporates Reydon within a "Market Town" designation in association with Southwold. Whilst this designation does not provide a specific housing allocation, it further supports that Reydon is a suitable location for reasonable and considered growth.
Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council S H Read

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1407

Comment The Parish Council is working towards establishing a Neighbourhood Plan, which may modify some of the views expressed above because any proposals will be more specific.

Please note that in considering the above sites the Parish Council has had regard to the indicative number of houses shown in the WDC consultation document and the footnote on page 67 – it thus assumed that these numbers were supplied by the proposers. However, following the public meeting (at which an advisor to the proposer of most of the sites was present but did not raise objection to the figures being used) the Parish Council has been informed by the proposer’s representative that the indicative numbers of houses shown are not those supplied by the proposer. The Parish Council is content that this has not unduly affected its findings because most of the comments it has received about the sites were in regard to the principle of development rather than solely sheer numbers.
B A Crockford

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 231

Comment All villages should be allowed a small amount of development to prevent communities from dying and perhaps to retain rural industries i.e. cheese making in Flixton.
Barnby Parish Council Ian Hinton

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1339

Comment Barnby Parish Council agrees with the Housing Distribution strategy as set out in paras 5.64-5.70, noting that no extra sites are expected to be needed in the larger villages. The 6 housing sites suggested by owners/developers in the village would treble the size of the village, and each has access problems.

None of the sites put forward for housing development fit the category "within the physical limits" of the village (para 5.64). Although some of them are "on the edge of the village" they involve other problems, particularly of access.

The main village access is already difficult to exit on to the A146, particularly to travel westwards, and has been the site of many near misses. Additional housing will only add to the problem and substantial developments will multiply the problem.

Sites at the eastern end of the village have the added problem of using Swan Lane as access. Already the subject of restricted turn movements, this junction is the subject of a consultation by Suffolk County Council to close access completely due to the number of accidents/near misses/illegal turning movements that occur on a regular basis (several times daily in the case of illegal turns). The lane is set within high banks and is essentially only capable of one-way working.
Benacre Estates Company Edward Vere Nicoll
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1529

Comment The village of Wrentham plays an important role in servicing its local community and thus is considered to be an appropriate and sustainable location for new housing development over the plan period. The village is situated between the key settlements of Lowestoft and Southwold, approximately 7 miles south of Lowestoft and 5 miles north of Southwold. The settlement is strategically located on the A12, which connects it with Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth to the north, and Ipswich to the south. The village has a range of local services and facilities which include several shops, two public houses, a church and village hall. The village is well served by the Number 61 bus, a daily bus service providing links to neighbouring settlements including Southwold, Lowestoft, Great Yarmouth and Norwich.
Blundeston & Flixton Parish Council Sarah Wells

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 288

Comment At a meeting of Blundeston and Flixton Parish Council last night, the New Waveney Local Plan was discussed. It was felt by all those present that the development of the Blundeston Prison Site will satisfy the planning criteria for this area and therefore other development areas in Blundeston should not be necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All of them but not so that they detract from the character</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
chris Morris

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1600

Comment 1. The amount of land proposed would radically increase the size of the village and could not be supported with the existing infrastructure.
2. All of the land proposed is owned by one person who already owns a substantial proportion of the residential property in the village. It would seem more prudent and reasonable to allow appropriate one-off developments on some land owned by others to be included to fulfil the small amount of growth the village can support.
3. As you are aware, Somerleyton Neighbourhood Planning Group is formulating a proposal for village development which will be put forward to the villagers to approve when completed, which should give a realistic reflection of local thinking.
4. Site 2 on the plan area the village allotments (much prized and fully utilised) and site 135 is the playing field, again, a very valued community asset. Neither should be considered for development.
**Chris Morris**

**Section**  
Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

**Comment ID**  
1604

**Comment**  
Only small scale expansion to maintain the rural aspect of the outlying areas.
Christine Tyacke

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1565

Comment 1. Blundeston has already had significant developments in the last few years e.g. Market Lane, Pickwick Way, Micawber Mews, The Street, so any large scale development is inappropriate, especially if the old prison site is already earmarked for housing development.
2. Blundeston has lost all its shops.
3. Blundeston does not have a doctor, dentist, chemist within easy reach.
4. The nearest doctor in Oulton village has now closed and Bridge Road Surgery has so many patients now that it is hard to get an appointment.
5. Public transport has been cut to almost nil.
6. With the already added development to village, the pond in Market Lane has recently overflowed in heavy rain, with water running down the road. Further concreting will make this worse.
7. There is very little local employment. (Is there any?)
8. There is only a small village school.
I would appreciate your thoughts on these facts when making decisions.
Colin Gooding

Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1336

Comment
I have read with abject horror your proposals for development in and around my village of Blundeston. What on earth are you people thinking! Blundeston is a smallish, delightful village which embodies all that is great about traditional English values. I moved to Blundeston 24 years ago seeking peace and quiet and a rural environment and thought I had found it. In those 24 years the village has swollen in size mainly due to infill development, which if done sympathetically I have no issue with. It has nonetheless impacted on the 'feel' of the village with increased traffic levels. Blundeston has little or no amenities, we have one village pub, a small school (struggling to cope with existing child numbers due to the closure of Middle schools) our only shop .......... a swimming pool shop which closed last year, and a wonderful community church. The closure of Blundeston Prison throws up the spectre of yet more development let alone your proposals for the other sites in the immediate area. Blundeston cannot cope with this level of development, the character of the village will be lost in an urban jungle akin to a small town. Why destroy existing villages and the quality of life of existing homeowners by over developing them? If you need new homes build new villages or towns!!

There are other significant issues to be addressed before any further development is considered; Doctors, Dentists, Fire Service coverage, Hospital waiting times, Flooding!

Doctors
The recent closure by the CQC of two doctor's surgeries in Oulton Village has dumped an extra 5000 patients on my local GP surgery at Bridge Road. Getting an appointment (unless you are dead or dying) is now extremely difficult with waits of up to 2 weeks for a normal appointment. Building the number of houses you propose in your plan will further exacerbate the problem unless new surgeries are provided.

Dentists
A similar story with dental care provision with many NHS dentists having
closed their lists for new patients with lengthy waiting lists.

Fire Service Cover
The Fire Service has severe underfunding problems resulting in many Firemen being laid off. More houses and more people will result in an extra burden on these limited services which is all well and good unless it's your house that catches fire.

Hospitals
There have been no new hospitals built in the Waveney area since I have lived here, our local hospital James Paget at Gorleston is, like the rest of the NHS ill equipped and hopelessly underfunded to cope with any increase in demand for hospital treatment. Current average wait for hospital appointments is in the order of three to four months.

Flooding
Many areas of Blundeston are affected by surface water flooding at times of significant rainfall. The sewers and storm water drains in the village were never designed to cope with the level of development we currently have, let alone any significant increase as outlined in your Local Plan.
This mantra of needing new houses is wearing a bit thin now, what we really need is control of our population, currently over 60 million and forecast to rise to 70 million by 2020. The UK is a small and overcrowded island, official statistics indicate that we are the most densely populated of any European country with the highest population per square kilometre.
To add insult to injury many of the 'new developments' in and around Waveney are badged as 'superior detached properties' giving local youngsters lucky enough to have a job on stagnating local wages, little or no chance of getting on the housing ladder.

Where is the infrastructure, the jobs, the services and amenities to support even considering the levels of development and increased population your local plan suggests?
The 'main road' through Blundeston is called The Street, a narrow often congested road which is frequently reduced to a single track road due to on street parking by residents who have no off road parking. At many times of the day it is akin to a slalom course trying to negotiate the haphazard and often careless parking of service vehicles and visitors to the residences in the road. Near misses and frayed tempers are commonplace at any time of the day when negotiating this road which represents the main thoroughfare of the village. More houses equals more people equals more vehicles equals more traffic which will further exacerbate the problems we endure now.

If more housing is required build a new town or a village somewhere else, don’t destroy the character and feel of our village by destroying our quality
of life.
There are many 'brown field' areas left to develop and building on Green Belt land is short sighted, once it’s gone its gone.
Who wants to live in a concrete jungle, an urban sprawl, I certainly don’t.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section
Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1803

Comment N/A
**David Bennett**

**Section**

Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

**Comment ID**

1374

**Comment**

On a wider perspective, mass development of Blundeston will increase both local and through traffic on the narrow country lanes in and around Blundeston. Thus making the area less safe for children and the elderly, as well as walkers, horse riders and farm traffic that frequently use these roads.

The local pre and primary schools that currently have an outstanding OFSTED rating will become overcrowded, resulting in a reduction in the standard of education.

The crime in Blundeston is currently very low and I and other residents will want this to remain the case. I believe that a development of this scale and with the inclusion of housing association families, will dramatically increase crime in the area, once again removing one of the main attractions to living in Blundeston.

It is unclear to me the reason for such a development, which will attract families into an area that already has high unemployment which appears to be increasing with the onset of lower oil prices.

I lived in Hopton on Sea for over 10 years during which the large estate was built. I witnessed all my current concerns for Blundeston, unfold in Hopton. I do hope Blundeston remains the lovely quiet rural village it is today and does not get ruined by profit driven developers, like many other villages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Many villages can cope with small scale development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**David Tansley**

**Section**

Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

**Comment ID**

1372

**Comment**

I write to express my serious concerns regarding the prospects of building excessive amounts of new homes around the Beccles area! With the current poor levels of general infrastructure, i.e. the roads system, parking, already over populated schools, poor medical centre standards, diminishing hospital services and bed numbers not to mention diminishing police numbers and a part time police station. It would reduce Beccles to a "stand-still. It is already very difficult at peak times and Saturday mornings.

Beccles is a beautiful little market town which needs to evolve sympathetically allowing the town time to grow at a measured peace with advanced planning and careful consideration.

It has recently been announced that over 900 new homes are being considered for the Ellough area alone, in Beccles. Few of the points I have listed above have even been given consideration!
Debbie and Carl Osborn

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1359

Comment With reference to the suggested planning in Blundeston i would like to make the following comments.

Roads: Since numerous development in Blundeston the small roads have become congested as there is lack of parking resulting in roadside parking and makes it difficult for the school bus and large vehicles to manoeuvre through the village.

Primary school is heavily congested during school time and is very dangerous and will not improve with extra pupils attending.

Large farm machinery have to use the small narrow roads to move to other fields and this is very important to our local farm industry, also used by cyclists and horse riders.

Loss of rural area: Blundeston used to be a quaint village with shops and businesses all of which has now disappeared due to the building of houses throughout the area, green land and open space is gradually decreasing and will soon lose our rural location if this persists.

The village location is important to us and do not want to lose its identity.

Public footpaths run through some of the suggested areas which are heavily used by ramblers and dog walkers etc.

Lack of infrastructure: There is not enough to support an increase due to no shops and since the closure of the prison there is a lack of local employment meaning that the majority of residents have to commute and adding to this would cause more problems with traffic and pollution.

There is a lack of public transport through the village and what we have is not very frequent so again not suitable for commuting to and from places of work.

There is no GP or dentist in the village and since the closure of Oulton Surgery has rested heavily on Bridge Road Surgery making appointments almost impossible, this will only get worse with more residents.

Drains: Lound Road near the pumping station and has been flooded several times
with sewerage water when we get heavy rain, this has only been since houses were built on the end of our road, this will again only get worse with more development. Lound Road also gets flooded further along. The footpath behind one suggested site which is a small field also gets flooded during heavy rain again running along the bottom of our road.

Blundeston Prison Site:
This has already been bought by a local developer and has been suggested that there should be some community assets for local residents providing possible employment but will probably be ignored and have no doubt there will also be development to which should suggest that this is sufficient for our area.
Debbie Read

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 340

Comment Don't know but many villages are close to town and may benefit from extra development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hayden Wright

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1657

Comment I have recently been informed of the proposed plans to develop land around Blundeston and build a considerable number of houses in the village and, as a local resident of the village, felt the need to contact you to register my concerns and dismay.

While I understand that there is a large drive for housing currently, other than the site of the former prison in the village, the proposals seem very ill-conceived and aimed purely at making money for the land owners and developers, at the expense of the local residents, who will be affected by increased noise, traffic and slashed house values.

The village is already unable to cope with the amount of traffic and cars in the area, the school is full and Church Road is becoming a real safety concern with the number of cars parked on blind corners, with a primary school during the week and church on sundays. The houses on the outskirts benefit from the field views and countryside aesthetic and this would be ruined by the proposals, particularly the proposed site on Flixton Road. The village prides itself on the community feel and the close-knit relationships; however this would be ruined by the proposals.

I would also question the validity of the proposals in terms of the target market for these houses as there are already a fair number of houses for sale and people would not move to the village for work in the same way they would Gorleston, Bradwell or Lowestoft.

I trust these proposals will be looked at from the perspective of the residents and will, rightfully, be denied.
Hellen Scheyde

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1373

Comment Regarding the Blundeston sites, in light of the prison development, the village does not need nor can it support further large housing builds. Any field development would damage significantly damage the environment and hurt wildlife, through noise, lighting loss of habitat etc, and alter the culture and heritage of the village, most of the village is road fronted buildings.
You have stated that Waveney has an aging population - the rural village is not practical for older people, lack of amenities, local of buses etc.
You mention schools, again in the area if attainment is low, which it is, fix this first before putting any more pupils in these schools and condemn them to failure !!
The infrastructure around Blundeston would not support any large proposed developments.
Flixton road does not have a speed limit (ie 60mph) it is currently very dangerous with the level of traffic on it now, further development would result in this road being busier and a tragic accident, it amazes me no one has been killed on it. I have witnessed many (non fatal) accidents on the road and many more near misses, trial cyclists and horses use this road frequently and it has many blind bends.
If there was another large scale development - where would these people work, I am sceptical about the predictions of wind farm jobs, if subsidies are removed which they will be, these will not happen. Also the low oil price and North sea costs means the oil related jobs will not happen either. If people are working in Norwich, again they are better suited living close to Norwich to reduce their carbon footprint.
I support the development in Lowestoft of housing and leisure facilities to redevelop derilict sites. I think effort should be put in here to create a Waterfront vision like in Norwich and Ipswich, this could result in jobs being created.
Ian King

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 553

Comment Blundeston - towards Lowestoft.
Ian King

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 554

Comment The area north of Parkhill Hotel.
Ian King

Section

Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID

557

Comment

With completion of new North Lowestoft link road, the best place to expand is to the east of this road towards Parkhill and Blundeston.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Scale should be limited in vilages and restricted to the larger villages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J E Simmons

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1377

Comment Response to land offered for development(Site Allocations)in the rural area, Blundeston.

1. It is noted that the 24 acre site, formerly Blundeston Prison acquired by a developer earlier in year, has not been included as a possible site for development. It is assumed that acquisition of the site occurred after the closing date for applications for inclusion in the current consultation process.

2. As it is understood that the site is for 'mixed use development', consideration should be given to its inclusion in the consultation process at the earliest opportunity.

3. Excluding sites 20 and 27 (providing a total of 13 houses), the sheer size of the other proposed developments would have a detrimental impact on the character, layout and balance of the village and therefore should not form part of the Framework Development Plan.

4. Under Option 2, rural areas are required to provide a 5% growth in the number of houses in 2011-2036. Currently there are approximately 520 mixed residential properties in the village.

5. Assuming the prison site is incorporated into the Development Framework, a mixed housing development of 40/50 properties, compatible with the existing infrastructure would provide a range of social, affordable and smaller two bedroom properties.

6. While such a provision would exceed the growth target, nevertheless the site would also provide the opportunity for the development of community, social and employment opportunities.

7. It is important that the correct balance is achieved as between the various component elements of any proposed development and having due regard to the existing residential properties in Lakeside Rise.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>James Toole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Janet Holden

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 86

Comment Ones that have good transport and good access to services.
Jeffrey Harris

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 307

Comment We have a rash of small villages and hamlets, - they don’t need or want large development but they do need rejuvenating with low cost homes for young people who love their home area. Many small localities could do with small but influential additions without spoiling their essential charm.
Jennifer Armson

Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1560

Comment I wish to object most strongly to the Waveney Local Plan in how it affects Blundeston. Blundeston has always been designated as a village but has met the needs of infilling and new building over the years. However, the plans as published would turn Blundeston into a small town, without the resources to manage the needs of an increased community. We do not have the infrastructure in place to meet the proposed new housing which would radically alter the entire ambience of village life. It is NOT a case of "not in my back yard" as the village has taken onboard the needs that Waveney has imposed to meet new housing needs, but a recognition of Blundeston as a VILLAGE community, and I would ask you to look elsewhere, where housing estates are already a feature, to meet the needs that are being imposed by central government.
John Bumpus

Section  Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID  585

Comment  Those villages where there is already adequate provision of services and facilities, or where the development is linked to guarantees of their provision.
John Mitchell

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1333

Comment Further to the flier which I recently received, I have the following comments to make:
The former Prison site is not shown on the flier. I assume that this is because an application for housing development had not then been submitted by the landowner, Steven George. I would respectfully suggest that this site will more than amply meet the housing needs of the village for the foreseeable decades, when it is brought forward for development. Development of this brownfield site would also help consolidate the existing housing around this site, and could incorporate new facilities for a growing village. I would therefore suggest that large scale developments, particularly as suggested by sites 42 and sites 63, are premature to consideration of the prison site.

It appears to me from my knowledge of the sites, of the village, and of the needs of the village that the best development option would be the development of the former prison site, with sporting and other facilities, allied with, if required, development of the field opposite the school, with a new car park for the school, or a safe short stop/drop off zone. The village needs additional housing but it would be a shame if this were to be achieved at the expense of the village character and appearance.
**Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee**

**Section**  
Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

**Comment ID**  
1802

**Comment**  
Kessingland has always been identified as a "larger village" and as such will accommodate a small amount of new housing, employment and services. Where a local housing need is demonstrated the priority will be for affordable housing. Most development will take place at Brownfield sites within the village, but some development may be needed on the Greenfield sites on the edge of the village. The Neighbourhood Plan Development strategy will therefore focus development within and on the edge of the physical limits of Kessingland village and prioritise the use of Brownfield sites for development.
Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1901

Comment Dealing with Potential Land for Development in Kessingland as set out in the consultation document, sites 41 and 173 are accommodated in the Neighbourhood Plan Proposals along with two other sites adjacent to them they are;

- Land at Laurel Farm West and South – 3.8 hectares of land to provide approximately 55 dwellings, 10 of which will be affordable housing
- Land at Laurel Farm – 2.1 hectares of land to provide 25 affordable homes held in perpetuity for those with a proven housing need and a proven local connection to Kessingland.

These sites were identified through engagement with local landowners and site promoters who were invited to demonstrate how their site would contribute towards achieving the following objectives;

- Availability – if the site is available for development
- Suitability – if, when assessed against policy restrictions (such as designations, protected areas, existing planning policy) physical problems (such as access, infrastructure, ground condition, flood risk, hazardous risks, pollution, or contamination), potential impacts (including effect upon landscape features and conservation) and environmental conditions (which would be experienced by prospective residents, it is a suitable location for development.
- Achievability – if there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site, this being a judgement about its economic viability.

Site SA3 (Laurel Farm East) is to be delivered as a site for 100% affordable housing to be retained in perpetuity for people with a local connection to Kessingland, supported by the findings of the Housing Needs Survey (see Page 9)

With regards to site 85 (Rider Haggard Lane), site 109 (London Road) and sites 119 and 125 (Church Road) – none of the landowners came forward during the 4 years that the Neighbourhood Plan has been in progress, except the owner of sites 119 and 125 (part of these sites are being used as allotments), who stated that they didn’t want to be part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. These two sites which are south of Church Road are part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
bordering the Kessingland Levels, and are not sites suitable for
development.
Excluding site 41, which has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan, these 4 sites in total would bring forward 100 homes.
The Neighbourhood Plan, which is as a result of 4 years consultation with landowners and the local community brings forward 3 sites which would bring forward a total of 105 homes plus in the case of site SA1 a commercial incubator facility, in respect of site SA2 a new playing field recreation area extension and in the case of SA3 affordable homes held in perpetuity for the residents of Kessingland.
Therefore the 4 sites put forward in the Waveney Local Plan are considered to be surplus to the requirements of Kessingland, the 'Housing Needs Survey' figures are more than covered by the Neighbourhood Plan proposals, which should be included in the Waveney Local Plan in preference to the other sites put forward.
Laura Gooding

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 646

Comment I am writing to object to these so-called planning and new development of houses in Blundeston. We do not want any more houses! We are a peaceful community who like our open spaces and the beauty of natural farmland. Just because some greedy farmer wants to sell his farmland because he'll get more money for it is not very considerate of others. We are a small village and want to stay that way. We live here because it's quiet we want it to stay that way!

The roads around the village are not designed for lots more cars which the development of more houses will bring. They are already more pot holey than road so this will cause more damage. The street in Blundeston has got progressively more congested with the building of more houses, as these houses do not all have driveways. It is like an obstacle course trying to get through especially on a busy morning with parents dropping children at the school or heaven forbid a bus tries to get down the road or an ambulance, it's just impossible!

Church Road in Blundeston is also a no-go area for anybody who wants to get through, its too congested with cars dropping off children at the tiny school. I went to this school years ago and remember it being a place where classes contained about 25 children and there were 4 year groups. If all these new families move here on average they'll have two children each so where are we going to squeeze them in?

I am objecting to all of the numbered plots on the piece of paper we received especially ones which want to build houses in the hundreds! Where are these people going to work? Where are they going to go to school? What doctors surgeries are they going to go too? Who is going to afford these houses? In my opinion the only land available for new builds is the old prison site at Lakeside Rise.

I also would like to point out the damage that new developments have on the environment as many animals and birds live in the hedgerows around here, noisy building sites will scare them away from what little natural countryside is left.

In closing I believe that as a village we are full! So no more houses thank you!
Lisa Doylend

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1562

Comment Blundeston

All sites proposed would cause a lot of light pollution and noise to the village. People live here because they don’t want street lighting, pavements and housing estates, they want a quiet, rural life. Bearing in mind there are a lot of equestrian / livery yards and privately owned horses and donkeys in the village, it would be dangerous to increase the volume of traffic at all, making the roads even more dangerous to horse ride than they already are. (An off road horse riding scheme was submitted to local council last year – “rights of way” – to try and get horses and donkeys off the roads by using tracks around edge of farmers fields. Unfortunately, just one farmer wouldn’t agree, on a council farm, so the plan didn’t get any further. I have enclosed a copy, on the change you could pass it on to someone who could help take it further. Many thanks.)

To sum up, I think that with the plans going through for the large development on the Blundeston Prison site, this alone should meet the development needs of our District.
Lynette Meen

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1631

Comment Bungay has good schools and had very little development so far.
M J Edwards & Partners Chris Edwards
Strutt & Parker LLP (Fiona Harte)

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 2069

Comment The village of Corton should be considered an appropriate location for development. The Core Strategy classifies Corton as a 'large village' in which 'a small amount of new housing, employment and services and facilities development will be focused on a number of designated larger villages. The village of Corton has a good range of shops, services and facilities including a shop, primary school and a number or pubs and restaurants. Corton also has good public transport links and acts effectively as a suburb of Lowestoft, which itself has a population of over 70,000. A regular bus service (1 and 1A) connects the village to the larger town of Lowestoft in just under 15 minutes; it also provides direct links to Gorleston and Great Yarmouth. Lowestoft has a much larger range of facilities including a range of high street stores, several doctors' surgeries, several primary schools, a high school and a railway station, with regular services to Norwich and Ipswich. The village could accommodate a growth level of approximately 150 residential dwellings.
Melvyn Earle

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 813

Comment Re Consultation – 7 sites around Blundeston
Please find herewith my comments, which I would be grateful if you would add to the residents' site development consultation process regarding the village of Blundeston.

I have been a resident in Blundeston since 1984, since when it has expanded out of all proportion. I moved here with my family from a large town in the North of England because we wanted a village life and a quiet, safe place to bring up our family. Blundeston has give us that. I see no justification to spoil that for those who, like us, may choose to move into the village, but neither can I see any justification for allowing a village to be turned into a dormitory town. By 2011 the consensus already showed 1,637 inhabitants living in Blundeston. Assuming three per household, if you allow just site 63, you are agreeing to a potential increase of 750 inhabitants and probably 200 more cars. Try leaving Blundeston and accessing the A12 in a morning and you'll soon see why such an increase is impractical.

A small development of 8 houses, such as site 20 on the outskirts of the village, would have little effect on the drains, which constantly overflow and flood Lound Road in the winter months, but any building within the village would almost certainly exacerbate this problem. The utilities companies fail to cope as it is when a deluge turns Lound Road into a new 'Broad' and sewage starts to rise in downstairs toilets in The Street, in Meadowlands and along Lound Road. Would site 49 be required to use a different route for its foul sewers, or would that also enter the village system? If so, I can only forsee a worsening situation for those living in the north of the village.

I think there needs to be some appreciation that villagers choose to live in villages because they want the village life. Allowing villages to grow into dormitory towns is not good for the community and destroys village life for existing residents. Look at Bradwell. Look at Belton. They have become little more than enlarged housing estates with no real character. If larger scale development is necessary, far better to have developers look further afield to the mass of open, green fields afforded by Norfolk and Suffolk and, if Waveney and surroundings needs to grow, invite them to create a new
village with new facilities that is planned from the start.
I am not against progress and I appreciate more housing is needed – but I am against expanding villages that have already grown substantially and lost their character in the process by such vast numbers as the consultation document suggests might be under consideration for Blundeston. Please, have a heart and leave a heart in our village!
Mr David and Mrs Mavis Wilson

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1552

Comment Blundeston, in our opinion, has been and will be, overdeveloped with houses. No new facilities, the school will be too small, inadequate drainage, sewage, etc. There will be more cars, some of the streets already have problems with vehicles not being able to pass through, and the bus service has been cut which is a problem with young and elderly residents. We are not just speaking in regard of the field at the rear of our property, but all the other sites which are being proposed. With the prison land already going to have 130 houses built upon it, the village will look like a town, not a village. Please would you reconsider many of these sites?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haycock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peter Carrier

**Section**

Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

**Comment ID**

937

**Comment**

Blundeston is a small rural village known locally for its connection to the Charles Dickens novel. The parish and council has allowed individual buildings to be raised as infills and small development, so far without too much damage to the look and feel of the village. The prison is a major development providing many homes and with the small developments and rebuilds this fulfills its quota of housing for years to come as I am led to believe the prison is a 10-year plan.
Stephen Brown

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 936

Comment Blundeston
The local school is already full, the parking along Church Road now needs a serious look at before someone is seriously hurt, the parking in general on the roads of Blundeston is getting worse and no improvement has been forthcoming, but yet we'll consider bringing in total another 4000 people, their visitors and their cars into the village too. The infrastructure and road network is not sufficient by any means, and yes they will say all the good stuff of investing in this area, but it will not happen and we will leave a suburban legacy for our children and with it we will see an increase in crime, flooding, noise, cars, people, accidents, do I need to go on? Yes I probably do, but I think my message and objection is very clear.
Ms Francis Harvey and Mr Paul Church

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1614

Comment There are no facilities or places to work in Lound, no shops, no school now, and just one or two buses a day, so all these extra houses would mean a considerable extra amount of traffic coming through Lound and surrounding areas on already overcrowded narrow roads, and I think it is a ridiculous idea to even think of building all these extra houses. There must be other sites nearer Lowestoft owned by Waveney District Council that could be developed for housing, rather than ruining a lovely village like Lound and spoiling more of this precious countryside that we are losing every year.
N Searby and E McLoughlin

Section  Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID  1413

Comment  I wish to register my dismay at all the sites that have been proposed for Blundeston in the New Local Plan. I have been a resident in Blundeston for approximately 26 years moving in to the village to enjoy living in a rural environment and all the benefits that can bring ie walking different footpaths, quietness, wildlife & fauna and exchanging pleasantries with passers by. Over the 26 years the village has slowly started to increase in size with in my opinion some very nice developments and a few eyesores!. Although I understand there is a need for more housing I believe that the village should essentially remain a village and not become a town. Definition of a Village; A group of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town, situated in a rural area. I think that all 7 sites should not have any development on them as once the former prison site has been developed there will be more than enough new housing in our village. I understand there is approximately 300 houses and a care home going on to the site. The last thing that I wish to see is Blundeston turning into another Carlton Colville or Oulton Broad!
Noel Longbottom

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1360

Comment 

I would like to object to the large parcels of land and numbers of houses being proposed for development in Blundeston. There are already two possible developments going ahead, the Prison Site and the land behind Pickwick Drive. The roads through the village from Hall Lane to The Street and Lound Road are in a disgraceful condition with raised manholes, potholes and sunken service strips which put an unacceptable strain on car suspension and exhaust systems for the residents who have to pass through the village on a daily basis. Parking on The Street is total chaos, cars are regularly parked outside 71 and 73 The Street directly opposite the junction from Orchard Close in contravention of the Highways Act. The School bus stops outside 67/69 The Street and when pulling away has to manoeuvre directly into the line and path of oncoming vehicles using the opposite side of The Street or from Orchard Close and when children alight from the bus there is the potential for a serious accident. I believe under the Highways Act double yellow lines should be placed opposite the junction with Orchard Close to provide a safe, clear viewing area for cars, children and the elderly. Any further development around the village would put an intolerable stain on the infrastructure in and around the village.

In conclusion a massive increase in housing would spoil the beauty of village life and turn the area into a second Carlton Colville and a further extension of Lowestoft. Please keep Blundeston as it should be a true Suffolk village.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1668

Comment Southwold and Halesworth
**P Mounser**

**Section**

Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

**Comment ID**

1563

**Comment**

Blundeston site 63 and 42

It would appear, alarmingly so, that at some time in the not too distant future to make Blundeston into part of Lowestoft and Corton through the huge green field development at Blundeston Road (165). Villages should remain villages and not become swallowed up into the town, or made a town as has happened to Carlton Colville – some small in-filling areas allowed but not massive green field developments. Where is the employment coming from to sustain the number of houses that could be built.

1. Wind projects cannot employ that great a number of workers. That particular industry seems to receive a lot of criticism – Gulliver (just one turbine) appears to be stationary many times, not earning its keep.
2. What other industries are going to be developed in the W. D. area? Unfortunately we are not the Cambridge of the far east.
3. It is all very well trying to encourage growth on the east coast, but the weather does not help stuck in the north sea. Wouldn’t businesses be better off inland where roads and railways are better? Certainly inland no risks of major flooding.
4. Probably the care industry would grow – already one care home to be built in Blundeston at prison site – at least on brown fields.
7. Major developments at Blundeston would need massive upgrading of the infrastructure (existing). Many of the roads are so narrow that lorries and wider vehicles have to stop in order to let pass other vehicles. No pavements from beyond the pond in Market Lane to A12, also Hall Road to A12. The Council won’t have enough money to solve these problems. Councils always seem to be crises led – if listens at all.

A number of people have two cars per household with the infrastructure as it is, surely it can’t be pushed any more – having taken 20 to 25 years to solve a surface water problem. Blundeston is a village of historic interest and should remain a village to not be extended.
Pauline Reid

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1488

Comment I know my objection will probably not make any difference to the decision the WDC make but would like to register the points I am concerned about should the building of the houses go ahead:

1. The road structure is not in place to accommodate the amount of houses proposed especially site 63 which is being considered for 242 houses and site 42 for 127 houses. I am assuming the access to the estate would be from Flixton Road (site 63) and Market Lane (site 42) which at their best are not wide enough now to take two large vehicles approaching each other. It is already very dangerous to walk along these roads without the extra traffic (a minimum of two cars per household) the estates would produce.

2. The location of sites 129 and 27 have no access apart from The Loke which is a rough track so a new road would certainly have to be built which would again be accessed via Market Lane. This means a total of 285 houses (including site 42) producing a minimum of 400 cars would be spilling onto Market Lane!

3. The present school would not be able to accommodate the extra pupils which the building of all the proposed sites would require. Would a new school be built? With the building of 242 houses (site 63) behind the present school there would not be any room to extend the facilities the present school offers.

4. The sewage system in the village is in need of an overhaul as it is as properties are frequently flooded during heavy downpour’s, the addition of extra housing would put a further strain on the system.

5. There are no facilities in the village surely the extra housing would require the need for medical services to be available in the immediate locality, i.e. Doctors surgery, chemist etc. A more frequent bus service would be another requirement.

6. Where would the money come from to pay for the extra amenities and facilities the building of these houses would require? Would this mean our Council Taxes would be increase? A lot of people already struggle with paying their Tax.

I can understand the building of houses on brown field sites is a necessity as there is a shortage of housing in the WDC area but surely the present
structure of the village and the expansion you have proposed (nearly doubling the present size) would require a major overhaul of the road structure and facilities that we have in place at the moment.
Peter Cockerton and Karen Evans

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1585

Comment We are not aware of any.
Rosalind Roots

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1554

Comment This letter concerns the potential building plans for the village of Blundeston.

There is a very serious and real concern about infrastructure and the need for new sewerage and water pipes for any new site. Where I live in The Pippins we had severe flooding because the present water system was unable to cope – even with our small number of houses. A neighbour involved in the original construction said that the six inch pipes were only intended for this very small estate.

Also sites 129 and 27 are close to fields and hedges where wildlife would be threatened. We are presently blessed with an abundance of wildlife, that I have recently been able to photograph, like hares, rare butterflies, deer, and varieties of birds including species on the decline like skylarks and cuckoo. It is a peaceful area enjoyed by the villagers and it is hoped that these sites will not be chosen.

The main street through Blundeston is very narrow and even at present is a problem for buses and large vehicles. More traffic would make access even more difficult.

The numbers of houses proposed would seriously affect the peace and tranquillity of our small village and those who have chosen to live here, apart from the main towns, for that reason.

Hoping that these comments will give local perspectives to the planners when considering the proposed sites.
**russell martin**

**Section**

Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

**Comment ID** 1364

**Comment** I am not sure if any villages need new development of significance. There will always be smaller scale 'infill' development but the character of places can be easily destroyed and we (I hope) have a shared aim to keep Suffolk Special.
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 610

Comment No where at risk of flooding and coastal erosion. Places like Wrentham, Wangford, Holton, and villages on the train routes could take more. We should also look at groupings of smaller villages where there are some facilities which need to be sustained.
Sandy Simpson

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1414

Comment You only have to look at Blundeston to see complete annihilation of a village, every spare blade of grass is currently being built on without a thought for expansion or requirements! Lound is unable to cope with any development. It has no facilities, no infrastructure or no desire to expand. Whenever A12 is shut, traffic is diverted through Lound causing gridlock and shutdown! Imagine that with 158 extra houses, not to mention flooding every time it rains would cause!!

I live on Jay Lane, cars feel they should do 100mph minimum travelling up and down it, Lorries hog the road that’s not suitable for them and the garden centre entrance is a cause of several near misses a day, either drivers who do not realise the speed (unnecessary) that idiots drive down a straight road (unrestricted even though there are 4 houses) or the many articulated foreign or other Lorries that are trying to exit or enter!! The horse riders and dog walkers or ramblers don’t even get a look in!

There are no general facilities even down to basic sewerage, many roads and additional building would be required turning rural into urban destroying wildlife and community.

Great Yarmouth are doing a wonderful example of that, building human rabbit hutches in close contact and lots of factories straight through a wonderful natural wildlife environment right on Suffolk border...Waveney must not follow this atrocious example of urban dumping.

Tourism is the lifeblood of this area, tourists stay nearby at coastal resorts and want to explore our glorious countryside, our pubs and our hospitality on foot, bike, boat etc....they do not want housing estates and traffic jams!

Get real.... Leave the countryside alone.... When it's gone it's gone...no tourists, no jobs, no countryside, no farming....more unemployment and lots of people in unhappy situations in packed in houses with no nearby facilities!

Think before you act.....terrible plan!
Sarah Cross

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 137

Comment Need to ask them.
Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 74

Comment Brampton has suffered from decades of planning restrictions resulting in population decrease and an ageing population, thus 2 pubs have gone + a shop, a garage, a doctors surgery.

Brampton also suffers from a dispersed community with no central focus to the village, but has great transport links with the A145 and the train station development within certain areas with community involvement could bring back a central focus point to the village and enhance a community atmosphere.
Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 2127

Comment

Villages that are provisioned in key facilities are suitable for new housing. Supporting the facilities in these villages will benefit smaller settlements nearby.

The Somerleyton Estate consider the following sustainable villages are suitable for new housing. The scale of growth should be proportionate to the size of the settlement whilst reflecting the provision of key facilities and proximity to sustainable transport options.

Somerleyton

The parish of Somerleyton, Ashby and Herringfleet has a population of 427 people and 208 dwellings. The demographic displays a near even gender distribution and an average age slightly higher than the average for Suffolk and the East of England. The Waveney District Council Village Profile for Somerleyton lists the key facilities which contribute to the sustainability of a settlement. The key facilities include a food shop, public house, primary school, post office and meeting place. Somerleyton has all of these. The additional key facility which Somerleyton benefits from and which many of the 'larger villages' in Waveney, such as Barnby, North Cove and Wangford, do not is the rail station which is on the Norwich to Lowestoft line. Because of this beneficial range of key facilities Somerleyton is better placed to provide for sustainable rural housing than similarly sized 'larger villages' such as Barnby, North Cove and Wrentham and also Blundeston. The Somerleyton Estate have submitted a number of sites to the local planning authority’s call for sites consultation. Applying the higher range growth option of 14% on the existing housing stock in Somerleyton this would equate to around 30 dwellings (10 of which could be affordable). This could be provided for by at least one or a combination of two sites in the village. The Estate are investigating with the local community the potential for providing land or funds towards the provision of a new village hall – a locally agreed priority. Proposals could also include relocating the existing playing field (on a like for like basis) to a more central location, alongside a new village hall. This would allow the existing village hall site to be redeveloped for a dwelling, providing funds for the community.
Blundeston

Blundeston has a population of 1637 people and 509 dwellings. The average age matches the average for Suffolk and the East of England. The Waveney District Council Village Profile for Blundeston lists the key facilities which contribute to the sustainability of the village.

The key facilities in Blundeston include a food shop, public house, meeting place and a primary school. There is also a church, football pitch, bowling green, tennis and netball court, millennium park, playground and post box.

The nearby villages of Somerleyton and Lound have additional key facilities accessible to Blundeston including a rail station, post office, food shop and a primary school, contributing to its sustainability. Blundeston is less well provisioned for key facilities than nearby Somerleyton.

The Somerleyton Estate have submitted a site to the local planning authority for consideration for allocation in Blundeston. Applying the higher range growth option of 14% on the existing housing stock in Blundeston this would equate to around 70 dwellings (23 of which could be affordable).

This could be provided for by at least one or a combination of two sites in the village.

The site is east of Flixton Road and north of the primary school. The site is large and it is not necessarily the case that if selected for development the District Council would wish to see it developed in its entirety. We present the site in its entirety at this stage for the District Council's consideration.

The Somerleyton Estate is open to the tenure and mix of housing which could be delivered on this site. Much depends on the final site selection and local needs but could include bungalows, affordable housing and smaller homes for first time buyers. These are all issues identified as important to the community in the 2005 Village Plan.

The site slopes down to Flixton Road and development fronting Flixton Road and backing on to Dickens Court may be the preferred approach for part of this site. Land to the rear of the primary school, could be reserved if there is any need for future expansion.

Development in this location would place residents within easy pedestrian access to services in the village and is a short car journey to the rail station at Somerleyton.

Development would be compatible with neighbouring land uses which include residential development and the primary school.

Lound

Lound has a population of 359 people and 154 dwellings. The demographic displays a near even gender distribution and an average age slightly higher than the average for Suffolk and the East of England.

The Waveney District Council Village Profile (Appendix 3) for Lound lists the
key facilities which contribute to the sustainability of the village. The nearby villages of Blundeston and Somerleyton have additional key facilities accessible to Lound including a rail station, post office, food shop and primary schools. The key facilities in Lound include a public house and meeting place. There is also a café and bakery in the former Post Office.
Somerleyton Estate Lord Somerleyton

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 2131

Comment 1.0 Executive Summary
1.1 Waveney District Council is in the early stages of preparing a new local plan which will determine the number and location of new housing and employment sites in the District for the period up to 2036.
1.2 The District Council has previously invited land owners to submit details of sites for future housing development. The District Council is now inviting comments on the submitted sites and the development options for the District as a whole.
1.3 Evolution Town Planning have been instructed by the Somerleyton Estate to make representations to this public consultation. This report includes commentary on the Site Options relevant to Somerleyton. Our responses to the consultation Questions have been submitted under separate cover on the District Council’s proforma and a copy is provided here in Appendix 1.
1.4 At the Call for Sites stage we provided background information on our sites plus some early ideas on how the sites could be developed; whether solely for housing or as part of a more comprehensive approach to deliver community facilities in Somerleyton. This could include providing areas of land for community use or improved facilities. These representations need to be read alongside our earlier submissions.
1.5 We will continue to engage with the community of Somerleyton as the local plan process continues. This will allow us to refine the potential development sites in the village and put them in the context of both the District Council’s district-wide housing needs and the community’s wishes for the village.
1.6 We look forward to working with all parties in shaping the future of Somerleyton.

2.0 Introduction
2.1 Evolution Town Planning are instructed by the Somerleyton Estate to make submissions to the Waveney Local Plan Review Issues and Options consultation 2016. These representations continue to promote a number and range of sites for onward consideration in the Waveney Local Plan process. It is important for consultees to appreciate that the Estate does
not anticipate, nor is looking for, all their sites to be allocated for housing. Nor for the full extent of many of the sites (as marked on the consultation mapping) to be given over to housing.

2.2 Evolution Town Planning (ETP) are experienced in promoting small rural sites either through development plan representations or planning applications. We also have site assessment experience from working in Council planning departments. As a practice we have 30 years of combined professional experience in this type of work.

2.3 These representations build on the information provided to the Call for Sites consultation and the draft Site Sustainability Assessment undertaken by the District Council.

2.4 All the sites submitted to the Call for Sites consultation remain available, achievable and deliverable. Each site is viable taking into account relevant policy requirements and obligations. Our Call for Site submissions had the benefit of guidance from Savills who are experienced in development viability.

2.5 The Somerleyton Estate have explored the potential for housing development in the village over a number of years and have engaged with the community on a number of occasions. This is because of the Estate’s land holdings in and around the village which could help deliver community facilities including land for a new village hall and improved amenity space.

2.6 These representations coincide with ongoing engagement with the community on the facilities they consider are needed in the village and where they would like them to be. The Estate feel it is necessary for the two mechanisms to complement each other.

2.7 The sites we continue to promote are edged in red on the maps in the appendices. They include additional information on potential sub-division and interrelationships with other nearby sites which is described in this report. This reflects the Estate’s aspirations, beyond simply developing housing sites, to contribute to the future sustainability of the village.

2.8 The identification of these sites results from a village-wide walk over and assessment of the development potential of sites in and around the village of Somerleyton. The plan in Appendix 2 identifies the sites, their location in the village and their surroundings.

2.9 Somerleyton is a sustainable village and, according to evidence in the Waveney Village Profiles, it benefits from facilities and services which many other villages of comparable size do not including a rail station; a rare commodity for even a ‘large village’ in Waveney District.

2.10 The Estate is open to the tenure and mix of housing which could be delivered in the village. Much depends on the final site selection and local needs but could include bungalows, affordable housing and smaller homes
for first time buyers.

2.11 The village has seen a number of notable developments over its history but there has been very little development since the 1987 planning permission for the Morton Peto Close development of 15 dwellings. Since then there has been one planning application for a new dwelling in Somerleyton.

2.12 It remains unclear at this stage how the District Council will be responding to Government guidance on boosting housing supply and recognising the benefits of rural housing. Therefore the recognition of the village's sustainability credentials is something we are pursuing through the local plan review.

2.13 In the meantime we invite the District Council to consider the information in this report, the merits of the sites on their own and in the context of the Estate's wider aspirations for the sustainable development of Somerleyton to enable it to 'play its role in delivering sustainable development'1 in Waveney.

3.0 Planning Policy

3.1 The Waveney Core Strategy dated 2009 was an early respondent to the 2004 Planning Act (in respect of the adoption of the Local Development Framework (LDF)) in comparison to other Council's in Suffolk.

3.2 While direct comparisons are difficult it is apparent that other District Council's direct development to smaller settlements than do Waveney. For example Suffolk Coastal (2013) identify local service centres and 'other' villages, St Edmundsbury (2014) identify local service centres and infill villages and Babergh (2014) identify hinterland villages.

3.3 The Waveney Core Strategy predates the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and is becoming out of step with national planning policy imperatives and recent Government requirements for local plans to be in place by early 2017.

3.4 For example the Framework requires local planning authorities "to boost significantly the supply of housing".

3.5 Also in comparison to other Core Strategies in Suffolk the Waveney LDF gives relatively little attention to the contribution that villages can play in contributing to rural housing supply. A large number of villages, often with access to local services, are relegated to being classified as being in the open countryside where a general safeguarding approach is advocated in the Waveney Core Strategy.

3.6 The PPG provides guidance on rural housing and states (our emphasis in bold):

Rural Housing How should local authorities support sustainable rural communities? Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306
It is important to recognise the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability, and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements. This is clearly set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in the core planning principles, the section on supporting a prosperous rural economy and the section on housing.

A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities.

Assessing housing need and allocating sites should be considered at a strategic level and through the Local Plan and/or neighbourhood plan process. However, all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas — and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.

The National Planning Policy Framework also recognises that different sustainable transport policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.

3.7 The Waveney New Local Plan is at an early stage and it is not yet clear how Waveney District Council will be responding to these national policy imperatives and how this will be reflected in revisions to the settlement hierarchy in the spatial strategy.

3.8 It is not known whether the District Council will review their settlement hierarchy and direct a proportionate amount of housing to all sustainable settlements including smaller villages previously overlooked or whether they will abandon the ‘blanket approach’ of settlement boundaries and allow development where it can be shown to be sustainable and well related to the existing built form. Much will depend on the responses the Council receives to the forthcoming Issues and Options consultation currently timetabled by the Council for early 2016.

3.9 There is the potential for a Somerleyton Neighbourhood Plan as the Parish Council have set out an aspiration to undertake one. It is unclear what the timetable might be for this plan as no formal application has yet been made.

3.10 The Parish Plan 2012 Village Survey included data showing a notable level of support for new housing development in Somerleyton.

3.11 It is also unclear how the District Council will approach the issue of housing delivery via Neighbourhood Plans. What is apparent is that it is a
risk for a District Council to rely on the contribution of Neighbourhood Plans towards the strategic housing delivery of the District when it comes to tests of soundness.

3.12 Therefore, as well as making site submissions to this Call for Sites consultation, we are making, and will continue to make, representations on the sustainability of the village of Somerleyton because we consider Somerleyton has been overlooked in the LDF; the village does not currently have a settlement boundary, despite clearly being a sustainable settlement capable of contributing to rural housing supply.

3.13 In terms of policy guidance on the site assessments below we have had regard to policies of the adopted Core Strategy (2009), the CIL Charging Schedule and the Development Management document (2011); specifically policies DM16 Housing Density, DM17 Housing Type and Mix and DM18 Affordable Housing.

3.14 The District Council acknowledges the need to review these policies as part of the new Local Plan because they are based on former national planning policy priorities and predate the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

3.15 These local policy documents are adopted and, as the Council acknowledges, form a useful baseline and we have had regard to them in the same manner.

3.16 The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) seeks to deliver sustainable development. We consider that the assessment below shows that the residential development of the sites we have submitted will meet the social, environmental and economic tests for sustainable development.

4.0 The Village of Somerleyton

Geography

4.1 Somerleyton is located in the north of Waveney District and is 6 miles from the town of Lowestoft and 8.5 miles from Great Yarmouth. Somerleyton is connected directly to Lowestoft by rail with an approximate 20 minute travel time.

4.2 It is equidistant to Blundeston (a 'larger village' in the Waveney settlement hierarchy) and St Olaves in Great Yarmouth Borough.

4.3 Somerleyton is a popular tourist attraction with 16,500 visitors in 2008. Tourist visitors visit Somerleyton for the Hall and Gardens but also the model village and the village itself; many arriving by boat or train and walking up to the Hall.

4.4 Somerleyton village and Somerleyton Hall are subject to the following environmental, planning and heritage designations:

* Conservation Area3
* Listed Buildings
* Registered Park & Garden
* 'Locally listed' features (buildings and structures included in the District Council's Conservation Area Appraisal) referred to in the Framework as 'non-designated heritage assets'

4.5 Somerleyton has seen incremental growth over its history. This has generally taken the form of distinct developments each responding to a particularly need or ethos and stamping its own character on the village. The village is predominantly a collection of distinctive groups of dwellings, some well known, which are easily identifiable from each other:
(Photos of Brickfields Cottages, The Green, Marsh Lane, Station Road, Morton Peto Close, Widows Cottages, The Street, Post Office and Forge Garage).

Demographics
4.6 The parish of Somerleyton, Ashby and Herringfleet has a population of 427 people and 208 dwellings. The demographic displays a near even gender distribution and an average age slightly higher than the average for Suffolk and the East of England.
4.7 Home ownership at 50% is lower than the Suffolk average of 67%.
Generally the demographic of Somerleyton is comparable to that of the county.
4.8 We understand from attending two parish council meetings and reviewing the 2012 Parish Plan household survey that the community is not against the development of housing in Somerleyton, particularly where this can contribute towards enhanced village facilities.

Key Facilities
4.9 The Waveney District Council Village Profile (Appendix 3) for Somerleyton lists the key facilities which contribute to the sustainability of a settlement.
4.10 The key facilities include a food shop, public house, primary school, post office and meeting place. Somerleyton has all of these as shown on the inset plan below:
(Plan attached).
4.11 The additional key facility which Somerleyton benefits from and which many of the 'larger villages' in Waveney, such as Barnby, North Cove and Wangford, do not is the rail station which is on the Norwich to Lowestoft line.

13.0 Conclusion
13.1 This report responds to the Issues and Options consultation and continues to promote seven sites in Somerleyton. It is important for consultees to understand that not all sites will be allocated. The number
and mixture of sites is intended to provide the District Council with a selection of site types from which to address Somerleyton's future housing needs.

13.2 There is a pressing need to deliver a significant boost in housing supply nationally and Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that rural areas can play their part. Somerleyton is a sustainable settlement and benefits from a range of facilities which some larger settlements in the district do not.

13.3 We have reviewed national and local planning policy and guidance and have visited the sites and toured the area. We continue to promote only those sites which met the Call for Sites consultation thresholds and the criteria set out in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment consultation methodology (Oct 2015). Our submissions confirm that all sites are suitable, available and achievable and that allocations for development would meet the economic, social and environmental principle of sustainable development.

13.4 All sites are available within 5 years and some are immediately available. No sites have any constraints that would make them unviable. All the sites we have reviewed have the ability to provide for a mix of housing types to meet the needs set out in the Waveney Housing Market Assessment and the 2012 Parish Plan Village Survey.

13.5 Sites such as Mill Farm, Mill Farm Field and the Playing Field could deliver more than housing and could contribute to the future sustainable development of the village by opening up areas in the centre of the village for open space and providing land for a new village hall and/or playing field in conjunction with development and this is recognised in the relevant site sustainability assessments. This is something the Estate is particularly interested in and we look forward to discussing these matters further with the community and the District Council ahead of the next round of public consultation in early 2016.

(Map showing sites and services and facilities in Somerleyton)
Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 2137

Comment Villages that have a good range of key facilities are suitable for a proportionate amount of new housing because supporting the facilities in these villages will benefit smaller settlements nearby.

The Sotterley Estate consider that, when considered as a single village, Willingham St. Mary and Shadingfield is suitable for new housing where the scale of growth should be proportionate to the size of the settlement whilst reflecting the provision of key facilities.

Willingham/Shadingfield benefits from a number of local facilities and services which contribute to its sustainability. The Sotterley Estate is open to the tenure and mix of housing which could be delivered in the village. Much depends on the final site selection and local needs but could include bungalows, affordable housing and smaller homes for first time buyers. The population of Willingham/Shadingfield is 330 and the village is central to the parishes and villages of Shadingfield, Sotterley, Willingham, Ellough and Weston which have a combined population of at least 700 people. This is important because, as set out above, the NPPF recognises that "development in one village may support services in a village nearby and Willingham is centrally located to these other villages."

The Waveney village profiles list the key facilities which contribute to the sustainability of a settlement. The key facilities in Willingham/Shadingfield include a public house, and meeting place. Additionally the village has the playing field, bus shelter and stops, post box and recycling point. The Sotterley Estate have submitted a number of sites to the local planning authority’s call for sites consultation. Applying the higher range growth option of 14% on the existing housing stock in Willingham/Shadingfield this would equate to around 20 dwellings (6 of which could be affordable). This could be provided for by at least one or a combination of two sites in the village. The Estate are investigating with the local community the potential of relocating the village playing field (on a like for like basis), providing dedicated parking off the A145 and potentially land for a changing facility or shelter.
**Sotterley Estate Tom Barne**  
**Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)**

**Section**  
Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

**Comment ID**  
2141

**Comment**  
3.0 The Village of Willingham  

**Geography**  
3.1 Willingham is located in the centre of Waveney District and is 4.8 miles from the town of Beccles and 7 miles from Halesworth. Willingham is on the Anglian Bus route between Beccles and Southwold. The A145 between Blythburgh to Beccles road runs through the village.  
3.2 The population of Willingham is 152 and the village is central to the parishes and villages of Shadingfield, Sotterley, Willingham, Ellough and Weston which have a combined population of at least 700 people. This is important because, as set out above, the NPPF recognises that "development in one village may support services in a village nearby" and Willingham is centrally located to these other villages.  
3.3 With the exception of a single listed building Willingham is without environmental or heritage designations that would inhibit development.  
3.4 The inset aerial photos below show how Shadingfield has developed since 1999 with a few infill plots and the 1998 consent for 13 dwellings at Woodfield Close (shown edged red).  
(Aerial photos attached).  

**Key Facilities**  
3.5 The Waveney District Council Village Profile (Appendix 3) for Willingham lists the key facilities which contribute to the sustainability of a settlement.  
3.6 If read in conjunction with the village profile for Shadingfield (because most of the village of Willingham is in Shadingfield parish which is the focus of the Shadingfield village profile) the key facilities include a public house, and meeting place. Additionally the village has the playing field, bus shelter and stops, post box and recycling point. These are shown on the inset plan below:  
(Map of sites attached).

10.1 This report promotes four potential development sites in Willingham in response to the new Waveney Local Plan Issues and Options consultation. It is important for consultees to understand that it is unlikely all sites will be allocated by the District Council. The extent of land
allocations in Willingham will depend on the increase in housing demand across the District since the local development framework was adopted in 2009.

10.2 There is a pressing need to deliver a significant boost in housing supply nationally and Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that rural areas can play their part. Willingham is a sustainable settlement and serves a wider group of villages with fewer facilities.

10.3 We have reviewed national and local planning policy and guidance and have visited the sites and toured the village. We have submitted only those sites which met the consultation threshold and the criteria set out in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment consultation methodology (Oct 2015).

10.4 We have submitted a number of sites, all for housing development. Some sites such as the Playing Field in combination with the site to the northeast (Site 134) could deliver more than housing and could contribute to the future sustainable development of the village by relocating the village playing field, providing dedicated parking off the A145 and potentially land for a changing facility or shelter. This is something the Sotterley Estate is particularly interested in and we look forward to discussing these matters further with the community and the District Council.

10.5 Our site assessments show that all sites remain suitable, available and achievable and that allocations for development would meet the economic, social and environmental principle of sustainable development. All sites are available within 5 years and some are immediately available. No sites have any constraints that would make them unviable. All the sites we have reviewed have the ability to provide for a mix of housing types to meet the needs set out in the Waveney Housing Market Assessment and evidenced local need.
St James South Elmham Parish Meeting Mary Henry

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 807

Comment Most villages in the rural areas of the district have some need for limited development, appropriate to their size, style, environment and situation and to maintain a balanced mix of housing for an active and prosperous population. See also our comments on the proposals made for St James.
Stephen Cole

Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1548

Comment Blundeston

Will the development needs of the District not be met or exceeded by the development of Blundeston Prison's site. I understand the site has been purchased by Badger Building, which I'm sure they will develop for housing in the future. Any development in this area will put even more traffic onto the road network particularly the B1074 since the construction of extra housing at Parkhill and the surround area, the B1074 is over used and the speed limit is very rarely adhered to. Putting more houses in the local area will increase the amount of traffic onto the already dangerous 'race track' they call the B1074.

I cannot believe Badger Building has purchased the prison site for any other reason that to building housing and they must be confident of getting the relevant permission to do so. Why put forward a local plan when clearly he prison site is going to be redeveloped but does not appear on the plan? If any building takes place on the proposed sites to meet the needs of the District does this mean there will be no development of the prison site?
Stephen Read

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 249

Comment Most if not all.
Susan Harrison

Section Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 2193

Comment Apart from 'in-fill' don't think there is any great demand for development, homes will no be affordable and used as second homes.
Susan Holmes

Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1571

Comment

Re: Waveney Local Plan: Blundeston
With regard to the plan provided.
Far too much development for such a lovely small village. We will have a lot of newbuild on all of the prison site, if you add all of this we will become just as unattractive as Carlton Colville. This must be avoided.
One of the big problems is the school parking issue. Just come and see what happens in our court at school times. It is a parking lot and quite dangerous at times. Church Road is chaos with cars diving about and backing up to facilitate the oncoming traffic in gridlock. Ridiculous. This will be made worse with more general traffic. Any of the development near the school must be held off until your office makes one of the big windfall landowners donate a sensible working carpark for the school. If they are going to make millions for the farmland it would at least benefit the village and maybe even save the life of a child.
Q15 What villages do you think are suitable for new housing and economic development over the next 20 years and what should be the scale of growth?

Comment ID 1561

Comment

I have been a Blundeston resident for 30 years and I was shocked, alarmed and angry at the local plan delivered for consultation. Blundeston has been a village prepared to accept the development of local houses preferably for local people over the years. Initially, what has alarmed me is the total of 469 planned houses to be sited in and around the Blundeston, mostly on greenfield sites (who gave permission for that?). Given your comment about "thoroughly assess all sites and filter sites down... meet the needs of the district" – whose needs?, I doubt it and am sceptical about the likelihood of a reduction in the plan submitted. If this plan is to be achieved this could account for over a thousand adults, plus their children/relatives to live without an infrastructure provision, schools, health (under pressure particularly G.P. surgeries for instance), social care etc. with a direct impact on the village itself with 1 pub, 1 school and nothing else.

In addition, the outcome of the development of Blundeston Prison – more housing, I am told, built by Mr. George, who I believe has bought Lowestoft Rugby Club with the plan in Gunton to build on site.

I am horrified about your plan and will be sending a copy to the Chairman of the Local Parish Council.
Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Alan Baguste

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 764

Comment Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council</th>
<th>S H Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?</td>
<td>Comment ID 1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment The Parish Council wishes to continue without settlement boundaries in the form of physical limits in order that the villages of Ashby Herringfleet &amp; Somerleyton continue to be regarded as open countryside when looking at housing and other development. When the current LDF was created it was identified that the developed area of Somerleyton is attractive because of the widespread nature of the development with large spaces between.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID
2000

Comment
Existing physical limits defined for Lowestoft work well and prevent sprawl but contain ambiguities – eg. Corton Long Lane and where housing in Camps Heath adjoins the new Woods Meadow development. There are almost certainly others. The ambiguities should be removed where possible.
**brian may**

**Section**
Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

**Comment ID**
261

**Comment**
YES TO PROTECT THE COUNTRYSIDE AND MINIMISE INFRASTRUCTURE BUILD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bryony Townhill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 1090

Comment Yes build on brownfield sites within the boundaries
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 1804

Comment Yes
**Section**

Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

**Comment ID**

1323

**Comment**

I agree with this approach. Development should be tightly controlled within existing/adjacent boundaries. An example of outside such areas is the St Felix Reydon current application which is taking housing into an AONB and applying for 70 houses on a current sports field which is a ridiculous overkill even before environmental considerations. The infrastructure to the existing developments is barely adequate e.g. drainage.

Even a cursory viewing of Lowestoft shows plenty of 'brown field' or 'gray' sites' available for housings.
Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 2085

Comment Gladman would be concerned with continuing the approach that defines 'physical limits' around the built up areas of Lowestoft, the market towns and the larger villages of the District. Such an approach will act to contain the physical growth of each settlement and will not allow the Council to react to changing market conditions.

The supporting text to this option also states that the intention of setting a physical limit will help to prioritise the development of brownfield land. Paragraph 111 of the Framework seeks to encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed, it does not state that brownfield land should be prioritised and this should not be carried forward in the emerging Local Plan.

A key objective of the Framework is to boost significantly the supply of housing; it also details the presumption in favour of sustainable development, neither of which restricts greenfield development in favour of brownfield land. It is therefore recommended that a criteria based approach consistent with the requirements of paragraph 14 and 49 of the Framework is used. Gladman recommend that the following wording should be used to replace the existing settlement boundary policy:

'When considering development proposals, the Local plan will take a positive approach to new development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Development proposals adjacent to existing settlements will be permitted provided that the adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development.'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Development boundaries should be retained, but it is suggested that they should be drawn with some limited potential for small-scale development (below five dwellings) in certain places to better allow some small-scale development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Jeffrey Harris**

**Section**

Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

**Comment ID**

308

**Comment**

Some of the towns such as Lowestoft and Halesworth need rejuvenating in a variety of ways. Others such as the Beccles/Worlingham conurbation are already crowded, whilst Southwold might lose its essential charm. It might well be time for a new exciting development where the modern thoughts on town planning can be applied, it will add a new vitality to the district.
<p>| <strong>John Bumpus</strong> |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <strong>Section</strong>      | Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development? |
| <strong>Comment ID</strong>   | 586                                                                               |
| <strong>Comment</strong>      | Yes                                                                              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Eade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Trew

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 19

Comment Physical limits are very important. Already Worlingham is already joined to Beccles. I would not like to see this connection further developed otherwise Worlingham will lose it's villagey feel.
Julian Rogers

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 506

Comment Yes- we should work within existing limits. This provides a clear boundary for all planners/builders/developers to work within and limits the opportunity for uncontrolled and speculative proposals that increase workload and cost on existing scare council resources and minimises adverse impact on developers
Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 1064

Comment

Provided physical limits boundaries are drawn appropriately, they can be an effective tool in guiding development to the right locations within the District. The existing physical limits boundaries were Adopted in January 2012. The existing boundaries have been drawn tightly and are considered to be too restrictive and in places are limiting to development in sustainable locations. It is therefore considered necessary for a comprehensive review of the physical limits boundaries throughout the District to be undertaken. Physical limits should be drawn appropriately to each settlement and should allow flexibility for more development in the sustainable settlements such as Lowestoft.

Physical limits can be an effective way of controlling development and protecting settlements from inappropriate and unsustainable growth. However, physical limits boundaries within the District are out-of-date causing them to be restrictive and limiting to sustainable development in suitable locations. An example of the physical limits boundary being out-of-date relates to Lowestoft and our client’s site at land south of Leisure Way. In this location, the Lowestoft physical limits boundary runs tightly across the properties on Gainsborough Drive. The current boundary does not include the land located to the north of Gainsborough Drive, which is now significantly developed by a Public House and Travelodge Hotel, with Tesco supermarket beyond. Our client’s site is adjacent to the Hotel site to the east and the principal for residential development on the site has already been established by the planning permission for an 80-bed care home in 2012.

It is therefore considered appropriate that the notion of physical limits boundaries within the District is retained. However, boundaries should be updated and amended where appropriate, to ensure they encourage, and do not restrict, sustainable development. It is requested that the Lowestoft physical limits boundary is updated to reflect the current situation to include our client’s site at land to the south of Leisure Way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Physical limits boundaries can be an effective tool in guiding development to the right locations within the District and it is considered appropriate that the notion of physical limits boundaries within the District is retained. It is appropriate that our client’s site at Lothingland Hospital is contained within the Lowestoft physical limits boundary and this should be maintained in the emerging Waveney Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haycock

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 892

Comment Wherever possible, the physical limits should be retained.
Anne McClarnon

Section

Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 660

Comment Yes
Nicky Elliott

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 725

Comment Yes.
Norman Castleton

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 419

Comment Most certainly yes. The present physical limits must be retained.
**North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Due to the present restricted infrastructure of the town, the current physical limits should remain as a safety facility to ensure that the already overstretched infrastructure is not made any worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Cyprien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes. There is little need to go outside the physical limits of Reydon at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Douch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | Yes.  
I agree that the physical limits strategy should help to "protect the countryside and natural resources and prioritises the development of brownfield land. It ensures that towns and villages do not endlessly sprawl out in the countryside". |
### Jonathan Blankley

**Section**

Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

**Comment ID** 45

**Comment**

Yes specific physical limits should be set for the next 25 years, and probably beyond. They don't have to be as existing, but there must be a line drawn otherwise you will just get permanent creep. This should also be in conjunction with areas set aside as permanent greenbelt to ensure that there are areas for leisure, relaxation, and for wildlife to flourish.
Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

John Norris

Comment ID: 830

Comment: yes
Robert Gill

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 394

Comment Yes
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section  
Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID  611

Comment  
Yes - this provides an element of certainty
Simon Muirhead

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 1472

Comment I write with reference to the above in connection with the current review of the housing allocations.
I act as Agent for an Outline Application (DC/16/1730/0UT). The site currently falls outside of the physical limits and we are pursuing an application under Policy DM22. That said, the Woods Meadow development which almost adjoins this site makes the development boundary appear somewhat illogical.
Could it be considered for the development boundary to be re-aligned as part of the housing allocation review? As can be seen from the attached extract, it would make sense for the boundary to be realigned to follow Church Lane and Wood Lane. This potential re-alignment would then bring this application site within the Physical Limits and would enable two further residential units to be delivered and added to the Councils housing land supply.
Somerleyton Estate Lord Somerleyton
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 2128

Comment The local planning authority needs to reflect current national planning guidance and avoid the use of blanket policies restricting development in some villages and preventing others from expanding unless evidence supports their use. We have described in our answer to question 14 that the local planning authority should consider allowing greater quantities of rural housing provision than was the case in the Lowestoft-focused LDF in order to reflect national planning policy and support rural communities.

There are two approaches to dealing with rural housing; one rigid and predictable, the other fluid and responsive; settlement boundaries and/or land allocations versus criteria based policies and no settlement boundaries. The later approach is one used in the Babergh Core Strategy policy CS11 and it is understood Mid Suffolk may take a similar approach in the review to their local plan. The former approach is taken by Suffolk Coastal, Forest Heath and St. Edmundsbury.

The Somerleyton Estate suggest using settlement boundaries and land allocations for Lowestoft and the market towns because the developments likely to come forward in those locations are larger and need to be properly planned to link to infrastructure etc. In the rural areas ('larger villages' and other smaller villages classified as 'countryside' in the LDF) the local planning authority should take a criteria based approach and allow development where it can be shown to be proportionate, sustainable and well related to the existing built form. This would follow national guidance on avoiding blanket approaches.

A criteria-based approach to development in rural settlements could help avoid public perception of top down decision making and would encourage land owners and developers to engage with their local communities.
Sotterley Estate Tom Barne  
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 2138

Comment The local planning authority needs to reflect current national planning guidance and avoid the use of blanket policies restricting development in some villages and preventing others from expanding unless evidence supports their use. We have described in our answer to question 14 that the local planning authority should consider allowing greater quantities of rural housing provision to trickle down than was the case in the Lowestoft focused LDF order to reflect national planning policy and support rural communities.

There are two approaches to dealing with rural housing; one rigid and predictable, the other fluid and responsive; settlement boundaries and/or land allocations versus criteria based policies and no settlement boundaries. The later approach is one used in the Babergh Core Strategy policy CS11 and it is understood Mid Suffolk may take a similar approach in the review to their local plan. The former approach is taken by Suffolk Coastal, Forest Heath and St. Edmunds.

The Sotterley Estate suggest using settlement boundaries and land allocations for Lowestoft and the market towns because the developments likely to come forward in those locations are larger and need to be properly planned to link to infrastructure etc. In the rural areas (formerly the 'larger villages' and other) the local planning authority should take a criteria based approach and allow development where it can be shown to be proportionate, sustainable and well related to the existing built form. This would follow national guidance on avoiding blanket approaches. A criteria-based approach to development in rural settlements could help to avoid the perception of top down decision making by the public and would encourage land owners and developers to engage with their local communities. Of course if communities wanted greater control over the precise location of future development or had specific plans in mind then a neighbourhood plan would be the appropriate vehicle for allocating land locally.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear

Section: Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID: 1284

Comment: Physical limits should be retained, especially around settlements in the AONB.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 1921

Comment Physical limits should be retained because they serve the very function of preventing sprawl, car dependency, and soulless communities. There are many sites previously allocated which have not yet been developed. Waveney's situation appears to be mirrored country wide. A recent CPRE analysis shows that the country's biggest housebuilders are sitting on enough land to build at the very minimum 600,000 new houses. The business model of high volume house builders is based on delivering maximum profit to shareholders. There is little incentive to build more houses faster; indeed, they are incentivised to build slowly as this maintains high house prices. Brownfield sites should remain prioritised.
Terry McDonald

Section Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?

Comment ID 104

Comment No, we should not be limiting the boundaries of possible growth for Lowestoft.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wellington Construction Ltd</th>
<th>Paul Pitcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q16 Should we retain physical limits for Lowestoft, the market towns and larger villages and continue to focus development within them and on sites allocated for development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Sensible for larger settlements whilst being flexible when promoting new sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Alan Baguste

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 765

Comment Tightly defined, otherwise it will become a free for all and a continual and expensive (for residents) round of appeals and challenges. The UK has a poor record in producing clear and succinct legislation.
Anonymous

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 170

Comment Not beyond Beccles southern relief road or similar by-pass.
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section: Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID: 2001

Comment: The line needs relaxing in areas where small sites ie 10 or less, might create opportunities for SME builders or those wanting to self-build.
brian may

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 262

Comment I THINK THE ONLY EXCEPTION TO TIGHTLY DEFINED LIMITS SHOULD BE AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR LOCALS.
Bryony Townhill

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 953

Comment It should be quite tight to ensure that people living in new developments have access to public transport. Otherwise people have to drive everywhere, including short distances. Tight boundaries will also mean that all derelict and brown field sites are built on before green belt.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Tight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Norman Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes very small scale developments where no sites have been allocated may be acceptable should be decided on a case by case basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Daniela Goodall

Section:
Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID:
1327

Comment:
One larger development would be better as this would incorporate new services, facilities, roads and communications causing less disruption to existing communities. Eg development in Worlingham.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Tightly defined. Anything looser will lead to developers taking liberties in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 1350

Comment Development boundaries should be retained, but it is suggested that they should be drawn with some limited potential for small-scale development (below five dwellings) in certain places to better allow some small-scale development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Limits should remain as they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Bumpus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>They should be tightly defined where there is a risk of settlements blending together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 520

Comment Tighter limits would be preferable as it will be almost impossible to control the destruction of the natural environment step by step.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Trew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section**  
Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

**Comment ID**  
1410

**Comment**  
We believe that, if a particular site situated away from the existing built development boundary offers a clear opportunity to address an existing and pertinent community need, greater consideration should be given as to whether development should be permitted on a site such as this. Clearly, the site should meet certain relevant criteria, for example in relation to access and sustainability, however if the site provides the ability to address certain community needs then it should be looked upon favourably.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 1816

Comment In a rural parish such as Kessingland, it is particularly important that development is directed to appropriate locations and that sprawl is avoided. The purpose of a physical limits boundary is to provide that direction. Kessingland does have clear restraints as to where growth can take place. To the east is the North Sea and a site of Special Scientific Interest, to the south there is the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 1065

Comment Defining physical limits tightly around existing built development is restrictive and out-of-date and is not encouraging of sustainable housing growth. Physical limits should be defined appropriately for each settlement in the District, allowing the greatest flexibility for development on settlement edges in the most sustainable locations, such as Lowestoft. Extending the settlement boundaries appropriately to the sustainability of the location will help to ensure that appropriate infrastructure, services and facilities are available to serve any future development.
Lesley Beevor

Section  Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID  780

Comment  tightly defined
Louis Smith

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 569

Comment I believe settlement boundaries should be tightly defined to prevent them from spreading outwards and swallowing nearby villages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The physical limits of settlements should be more loosely defined to allow for the small scale development around settlement edges. Edge of settlement sites allow for the logical extension of villages provide an excellent opportunity to develop sites that reflect the character of the local settlement whilst also being able to provide locations for the expansion of local services and facilities if required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haycock

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 893

Comment If 'small scale' means less than 30 dwellings, then some development pockets around settlement edges might be acceptable.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 661

Comment We should maintain the status quo on this aspect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Development tightly defined around existing built development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Blankley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Tightly defined otherwise the boundaries will just continue to creep outwards in the way that has happened with Lowestoft absorbing Oulton, Carlton, Gunton and Kirkley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 2081

Comment With regard to housing, the remaining target for Southwold and Reydon could be met by the development of the Station Road site (142), some infill development in Reydon and modest expansion of the Reydon village envelope on the lines already allowed for affordable housing under the Rural Exceptions policy (DM22).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert Gill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 612

Comment They should be defined more loosely to allow some flexibility over time. For example, South Norfolk's Local Plan Inspector asked the LPA to include all the exception housing that had been built within settlement boundaries.
Somerleyton Estate Lord Somerleyton
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 2129

Comment In Somerleyton, if the local planning authority were to apply a settlement boundary, the Somerleyton Estate consider it should be drawn tightly. This is because a loose settlement boundary, while it might allow small sites of one or two dwellings, it will not allow larger proportionately sized proposals, which can also contribute to the village's infrastructure, to come forwards. In Somerleyton all the sites that have been proposed are on Estate land and, as we set out in our response to the call for sites consultation, the Estate is currently engaged in the village exploring the potential for village development contributing to village infrastructure in some way; whether that be by providing land and/or funds towards a new village hall or other local priorities.
Sotterley Estate Tom Barne
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 2139

Comment In Willingham/Shadingfield, if the local planning authority were to apply a settlement boundary, the Sotterley Estate consider it should be drawn tightly. This is because a loose settlement boundary, while it might allow small sites of one or two dwellings, it will not allow larger proportionately sized proposals which can also contribute to the village's infrastructure to come forwards. In Willingham/Shadingfield the majority of the sites which have been proposed are on Estate land and, as we set out in our response to the call for sites consultation, the Estate is minded to explore the potential for village development contributing to village infrastructure in some way.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID 1285

Comment Physical limits should be tightly defined, with any areas for small-scale development around settlement edges identified within the Local plan.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section  Q17 Should physical limits be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely to allow for more small scale development around settlement edges?

Comment ID  1922

Comment  Retain tightly defined physical limits with clearly defined exceptions that address car dependency, design, protection of green space, etc.
Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section | Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Comment ID | 2002

Comment | A criteria based approach to physical limits would be difficult and lead to endless disputed sites around the perimeter of the settlement.
Bryony Townhill

Section

Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Comment ID

952

Comment

Development proposals should be carefully scrutinised to make sure that there is not a more suitable, non green field, site available for development. It would be cheaper for developers to build on fields rather than on derelict sites so the council would need to be very careful that they don't build all over green field areas.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Comment ID 1806

Comment Do not remove all physical limits see above. [Yes very small scale developments where no sites have been allocated may be acceptable should be decided on a case by case basis.]
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Comment ID 1712

Comment The countryside and natural resources should not be adversely affected.
Section Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Comment ID 1818

Comment Engagement with the Community by the Neighbourhood Planning Team over this subject led to the following draft policy being drawn up and included in the Neighbourhood Plan.

"Development in Kessingland parish shall be focused within the physical limits boundary of Kessingland village as identified on the proposal map. Development proposals will be supported within the physical limits boundary subject to compliance with other policies in the development plan.

Development proposals outside the physical limits will not be permitted unless

* They represent proposals to deliver the site allocations (policies SA1, SA2, SA3, CI3 and C14)
* It is infill development or another exception such as affordable housing, barn conversion, or agricultural workers dwelling required to support the rural economy
* Any review of the Waveney Core Strategy requires additional housing or the identified housing site allocations do not proceed; or
* They relate to necessary utilities infrastructure and where no reasonable alternative location is available"
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Comment ID 1066

Comment Removing the physical limits boundaries could set a precedence for development in unsustainable locations and therefore it is considered that the principal of physical limits should be retained but the boundaries should be reconsidered, as set out in our responses to questions 16 and 17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Removing the physical limits boundaries could set a precedence for development in unsustainable locations and therefore it is considered that the principal of physical limits should be retained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haycock

Section Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Comment ID 894

Comment Clear zones ('conservation zones') should be required to prevent existing estates from feeling subsumed. Developers should be required to use computer modelling to assess traffic impact.
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Comment ID 47

Comment Don’t remove the physical limits, developers will just use that as another point in their favour.
Section Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Comment ID 2130

Comment The Somerleyton Estate believe that Lowestoft and the market towns would benefit from settlement boundaries and site allocations to allow large scale development to come forward in a planned and integrated fashion. However in the rural areas blanket policy approaches should be avoided to be compliant with national planning guidance.

We have suggested a policy approach to respond to this below and it consists of an overarching settlement framework and a subservient criteria based policy for assessing rural housing development outside of Lowestoft and the market towns. We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss these ideas.

The overarching 'settlement pattern' policy for this approach could categorise settlements into the following groups and read as follows:

1. Lowestoft and Market Towns: settlement boundaries and land allocations.
2. 'Well Provisioned' Villages (including but not limited to 'larger' villages from the LDF) with a good range of key facilities serving a wider rural area.
3. 'Part Provisioned' Villages with some key facilities serving a more localised area and capable of accommodating a proportionate amount of growth
4. The countryside – general development restriction applies.

'Well Provisioned' villages will act as a focus for development in the rural area outside of Lowestoft and the market towns in order to safeguard key facilities which serve a wider area. Development proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria based policy below. Additionally, site allocations to meet housing and employment needs may be made in neighbourhood plans. The Well Provisioned villages are listed [in the table above].

'Part Provisioned' villages will accommodate some development to help meet the needs within them and retain their key facilities. Development proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria based policy below. Additionally, site allocations to meet housing and employment needs may be made in neighbourhood plans. The Part Provisioned villages are listed [in the table above].
The criteria-based policy could take the following form:
The Well Provisioned and Part Provisioned villages identified in the [settlement pattern] policy provide for the day-to-day needs of local communities. Facilities and services such as shops, post offices, pubs, petrol stations, community halls, etc that provide for the needs of rural communities will be safeguarded.

All development proposals in Well Provisioned and Part Provisioned villages will be assessed against the [criteria based policy] below:

Proposals for development for Well Provisioned villages will be approved where proposals score positively when assessed against the following matters and to the satisfaction of the local planning authority (or other decision maker) where relevant and appropriate to the scale and location of the proposal:

* Landscape, environmental and heritage impacts
* Location context and relationship to the built form/settlement pattern
* Responsive to local needs particularly the quantity and tenure of affordable housing
* The cumulative impact of development in respect of social, physical and environmental impacts

Development in Part Provisioned villages will be approved where proposals are able to demonstrate a close functional relationship to the existing settlement on sites where the relevant issues listed above are addressed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority (or other decision maker) and where the proposed development is acceptable in terms of:

* Design, scale, layout, character etc.
* Responsive to local needs such as affordable housing, targeted market housing, or supporting/providing local infrastructure identified in an adopted community local plan / neighbourhood plan or through pre-application consultation where such plans do not exist or are out of date
* Supports local services and/or creates or expands employment opportunities
Sotterley Estate Tom Barne  
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

**Section**  Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

**Comment ID**  2140

**Comment**

The Sotterley Estate believe that Lowestoft and the market towns would benefit from settlement boundaries and site allocations to allow large scale development to come forward in a planned and integrated fashion. However in the rural areas blanket policy approaches should be avoided to be compliant with national planning guidance. We have suggested a policy approach to respond to this below and it consists of an overarching settlement framework and a subservient criteria based policy for assessing rural housing development outside of Lowestoft and the market towns. We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss these ideas.

The overarching 'settlement pattern' policy for this approach could categorise settlements into the following groups:

* Lowestoft and Market Towns: settlement boundaries and land allocations.
* 'Well Provisioned' Villages ('larger' villages in the LDF) with a good range of key facilities serving a wider rural area.
* 'Part Provisioned' Villages with some key facilities serving a more localised area and capable of accommodating a proportionate amount of growth
* The countryside – general development restriction applies.

'Well Provisioned' villages will act as a focus for development in the rural area outside of Lowestoft and the market towns in order to safeguard key facilities which serve a wider area. Development proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria based policy below. Additionally, site allocations to meet housing and employment needs may be made in neighbourhood plans. The Well Provisioned villages are listed [in the table above].

'Part Provisioned' villages will accommodate some development to help meet the needs within them and retain their key facilities. Development proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria based policy below. Additionally, site allocations to meet housing and employment needs may be made in neighbourhood plans. The Part Provisioned villages are listed [in the table above].

The criteria-based policy could take the following form:

The Well Provisioned and Part Provisioned villages identified in the
[settlement pattern] policy provide for the day-to-day needs of local communities. Facilities and services such as shops, post offices, pubs, petrol stations, community halls, etc that provide for the needs of rural communities will be safeguarded.

All development proposals in Well Provisioned and Part Provisioned villages will be assessed against the [criteria based policy] below:

Proposals for development for Well Provisioned villages will be approved where proposals score positively when assessed against the following matters and to the satisfaction of the local planning authority (or other decision maker) where relevant and appropriate to the scale and location of the proposal:

* Landscape, environmental and heritage impacts
* Location context and relationship to the built form/settlement pattern
* Responsive to local needs particularly the quantity and tenure of affordable housing
* The cumulative impact of development in respect of social, physical and environmental impacts

Development in Part Provisioned villages will be approved where proposals are able to demonstrate a close functional relationship to the existing settlement on sites where the relevant issues listed above are addressed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority (or other decision maker) and where the proposed development is acceptable in terms of:

* Design, scale, layout, character etc.
* Responsive to local needs such as affordable housing, targeted market housing, or supporting/providing local infrastructure identified in an adopted community local plan / neighbourhood plan or through pre-application consultation where such plans do not exist or are out of date
* Supports local services and/or creates or expands employment opportunities
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q18 If we remove physical limits, what criteria should be put in place to address the issues discussed above?

Comment ID 1923

Comment No comment.
Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

B A Crockford

Section  Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID  301

Comment  If we expect developers to construct new houses, why disincentivise them with the £50.00 per sq.M. CIL tax?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>In reality CIL is the only system available to the Council at present to fund infrastructure needs arising from development, but it has its shortcomings. The paperwork is unnecessarily complicated and in some parts repetitive. Rates need to be set with care to avoid rendering sites uneconomic to develop and it will take many years to secure a sufficient fund to achieve anything worthwhile. Prudential borrowing against the income stream might be a way forward to fund larger projects. Existing levy rates seem presently to be appropriate but any increases my change that situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 1092

Comment We haven't seen any positive benefit in recent years that this money has provided in developing the infrastructure. In Carlton Colville it is very difficult to get appointments with doctors at short notice. There is no dentist or post office.
The new roads are there to get to the new estates and appear not to enhance the area and it appears that more consideration could have been given to the planning of them because Carlton Colville is now an area of three distinct parts with no centre.
The open spaces that have been provided by the developers appear to have been generally provided on land that is unfit for building on such as old tips, and that the developers could not use anyway.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Probably the only way but the rates are putting serious costs onto the free market housing along with affordable housing can add over £20 to the price or a house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Sonia Barker

Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 1319

Comment Money needs to be provided to fund a bus shelter opposite the train station to encourage a joined up approach to public transport for train passengers who want to travel south of the bridge. In addition the Railway station still lacks the updating that its historic iconic status (linked to Sir Samuel Morton Peto)needs. A £10,000 grant towards its improvement does not as yet appear to have had any impact.
CTC John Thompson

Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 174

Comment It depends exactly what the question is asking. It is certainly appropriate that developers should contribute but the amount/percentage of the total sum necessary of the contribution might depend on a number of factors. I think the question needs re-wording.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Debbie Read</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Bumpus

Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 588

Comment Given the state of the local infrastructure it doesn't look like it! Make the provision of new development dependent on an existing or guaranteed infrastructure. For example, development in Lowestoft should be concentrated north of Lake Lothing until the third crossing is guaranteed to take place.
Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 521

Comment The Community Infrastructure Levy is a pittance compared to the damage many developments cause and the strain that they place on the infrastructure of the community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | Under the National Planning Policy Framework where practical Community Infrastructure Levy should be worked up and tested alongside the Local Plan.  
The Community Infrastructure Levy should support and incentivise new development, particularly placing control over a meaningful proportion of the funds raised with the neighbourhoods where development takes place.  
Currently at Waveney District Council, Towns and Parish Councils receive 15% of CIL funding, which are raised in their Town or Parish Council, a further 10% will be available for councils who have an adopted Neighbourhood Plan in place.  
Currently Kessingland has lost out after the replacement of section 106 with CIL on any current development which started prior its introduction.  
However contained within the Neighbourhood Plan are development proposals put forward by the Community that would attract CIL and therefore this should be passed to Kessingland Parish Council in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. |
Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 2153

* The Council should consider a bespoke approach to infrastructure contributions where on-site provision achieves greater public benefits. Whilst we have no objection in principle to the application of a Community Infrastructure Levy, it is not necessarily appropriate to apply rigidly or without exception where greater benefits can be delivered through on-site provision.

Larkfleet’s proposed development at Beccles seeks to provide a comprehensive sustainable new community. It will make provision for community facilities on site which benefit both the future residents of the development and those existing residents in the surrounding community. The community facilities it will provide - including a school, community/indoor sports building, playing pitches, allotments, public open spaces, and a possible doctors/dentist surgery – would provide significant wider public benefits. Conversely, it would not generate any significant detrimental impacts on existing infrastructure which would require mitigation.

In this respect, it is considered that a Community Infrastructure Levy would not be appropriate in this instance due to its inflexibility and that a bespoke approach to Planning Obligations tailored to the specific needs and opportunities that the development gives rise to should be considered as more appropriate for such a development.
Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 895

Comment Yes, but the Levy may not always by itself be enough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong> 662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> Yes. Continue to make developers pay for the &quot;right&quot; to develop their plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 421

Comment I do not like the Community Infrastructure Levy because this may help the forwarding of totally unsuitable developments. It is also probably not large enough and too haphazard to be a reliable source of funding. If no alternative can be found then the Levy needs to be far, far higher.
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

Section
Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID
1186

Comment
The money raised won't be enough
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 52

Comment As new housing impacts on the existing infrastructure, then a levy is appropriate in order to improve or expand the infrastructure. The level of the levy should reflect how well each development meets the identified needs of the community. I.e. If the housing mix reflects local needs, the levy should be lower, and if not, then higher. Also consideration should be given to additional green and/or leisure spaces that are included, that make provision for the wider community.
Robert Williamson

Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 504

Comment Its a good way BUT all developers must pay it this include the big boys I understand one of the big firms did not pay on one of his sites in Halesworth? I know you always chase the one off houses
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 613

Comment I am not a fan of the CIL as it is not negotiable. With Section 106, rather than a blanket fee payable it is more easy to tailor to what is actually needed in an area or specific location. It certainly shouldn't be any higher than it is now. I also think you should look at maybe excluding some areas from the CIL zones. For example, Breckland has taken an approach where the poorer more rural areas are exempt. Quite a large part of their district is excluded. This encourages growth in the rural areas.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section  Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID  1924

Comment  In Southwold and Reydon, there has been chronic underinvestment in waste water reticulation and treatment and sustainable transport infrastructure (parking in Southwold, and safe cycling routes connecting Southwold and Reydon, and encouraging cycling within Southwold). To upgrade these will be very expensive and we suspect beyond the amount of money that CIL generates.

The difficulty that we see with CIL is that it generates an ad hoc approach, and does not take account of the incremental impact of small new build developments or conversions that add inhabitants and vehicles; the cumulative impact is to overload one element of local infrastructure, say wastewater treatment. Also, the cost of upgrading the wastewater treatment plant may be more than the development can pay for but because of the need for more housing, the infrastructure system is stretched with band aids and the project goes ahead.

Infrastructure should be put in place before new development takes place. This means that project planning and financial modelling needs to encompass incremental and also consequential infrastructure costs which may be physically distant from the project. E.g., housing development of St Felix playing fields will rely on wastewater treatment plant in Southwold.
St John’s Hall Farms
Bidwells (John Long)

Section  Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID  1387

Comment  St John’s Hall Farms considers that the CIL is still an appropriate mechanism, for securing infrastructure. The CIL rate will need to be regularly assessed against market conditions, housing and land developments costs and values etc., to ensure it remains viable. Also the Council will need to remain responsive to requests to reduce the level of affordable housing where viability is or becomes an issue.
The Slater Family
Bidwells (John Long)

Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 2225

Comment The Slater Family considers that the CIL is still an appropriate mechanism, for securing infrastructure. The CIL rate will need to be regularly assessed against market conditions, housing and land developments costs and values etc., to ensure it remains viable. Also the Council will need to remain responsive to requests, to reduce the level of affordable housing where viability is or becomes an issue, such as on-site extraordinary costs or fluctuations in the housing market.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Early days but impression is that in a largely rural area I think this is the worst of all worlds – inflexible, too long term in terms of accruing funding for projects, likely gap in funding – unfulfilled delivery issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wendy Summerfield

Section Q19 Is the Community Infrastructure Levy the most appropriate way of securing new and improved infrastructure? Are the existing rates of the levy appropriate?

Comment ID 272

Comment The current CIL is sufficient but it should be shared among the towns and villages in a more fair manner - rather than as is with the majority of infrastructure being biased toward Lowestoft.
Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section  Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID  2004

Comment  Lowestoft has cycling rates well above the county and national average and for the most part connectivity in the town, for cyclists is good. There are some glaring omissions which with a little effort could be resolved, especially the need for improved links from Harbour Road over the railway to Normanston Park and better signage. Consideration also needs to be given to the provision of electric car charging points in future development.
**Beccles & Bungay Cycle Strategy Sue Bergin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Streets for People - blanket 20mph speed limits in residential streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced speed limits on rural roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure cycle route are direct, continuous, attractive and safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Putting sustainable modes first in the planning of new developments - in terms of access &amp; parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the need to travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote &quot;active travel&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand management by restricting access and parking for motorised vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging car free development in town centres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beccles and Bungay Cycle Strategy Ian Reid

Section Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID 1176

Comment Increase number of shared use walking/cycling paths. Create more pedestrianised areas within towns and villages. Actively promote the use of public transport - rail and bus and create an integrated network of pedestrian/cycle paths linked to bus and rail routes. Reduce speed limits in towns and on rural roads - max 20mph in towns.
Bourne Leisure Ltd (Lichfields)
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Miss Heslop)

Section  Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID  2165

Comment  Whilst Bourne Leisure endorses the proposed approach to increase sustainable modes of transport, the Company would however emphasise that in the case of some land uses such as tourism, there is often no feasible alternative available, other than the private car, for reaching more remote areas.

There is therefore a need for policy and any supporting text within the emerging Local Plan to recognise in relation to tourism uses, such as coastal village resorts/holiday parks which are car dependent, that there is often no feasible alternative available other than the private car for reaching tourism uses/areas.

Bourne Leisure therefore considers that the emerging Plan should promote non-car modes of transport where feasible, but recognise the reality of car-based access, particularly in terms of tourism-related development.
<p>| brian may |
|---|---|
| Section | Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged? |
| Comment ID | 263 |
| Comment | DEVELOPMENT CLOSE TO LOWESTOFT OR ONE OF THE MARKET TOWNS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED OVER DEVELOPMENT IN REMOTER VILLAGES, IF THE DEVELOPMENT WAS ON A PUBLIC TRANSPORT ROUTE OR WITHIN CYCLING DISTANCE SO MUCH THE BETTER. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section | Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID | 176

Comment

While many of the improvement for cycling in Waveney are welcome and steps the right way, there needs to be the political courage to discourage car use for short journeys. It does not have the detrimental effect on the economy so many argue and people do adjust.

I am broadly supportive of the off-road facilities in Waveney but WDC’s Cycle Strategy is far too much about getting cyclists off the roads. Indeed, it seems WDC thinks cyclists need to come off the roads at every possible opportunity. One comment particularly concerns me: "...thus removing cyclists from all roads in this part of Southwold." Why should it be desirable to remove cyclists from those roads? In fairness, I understand what WDC's thinking is but it is misguided and could be interpreted as meaning cyclists need to come off the roads because they hinder drivers. Certainly the comment will be liked by 'anti-cyclist' drivers. It is misguided because it does not improve cycling safety overall if we continually take cyclists off roads where traffic levels are not intolerably high. There physically cannot be off-road facilities everywhere and the more cyclists there are on the roads the safer cycling is because 'safety in numbers' takes effect. Off-road facilities where not really necessary arguably take cyclists off the roads. Acknowledging that as far as I know it is not an issue in Waveney, some of the worst accident spots for cyclists are where off-road facilities end and cyclists re-join the carriageway. There is a sort of ironically unfortunate logic to that! Cycling UK’s stance is that off-road facilities are very really necessary on urban residential roads.

One of the best ways of encouraging more cycling is 20 mph speed limits - cycling trebled in Edinburgh as a result! If the third crossing comes, I suggest reducing the Bascule bridge to two lanes for motor vehicles by having two carriageways in both directions just for cyclists. it would promote cyclist as a direct and often quicker way of travelling between south and north Lowestoft and encourage footfall in the town centre and Kirkley shopping areas.

I have to say the Waveney Cycle Strategy has a feel of being produced by well meaning amateurs, even if they cycle themselves.
Environment Agency

Section Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID 2099

Comment We encourage strategically planned green and blue infrastructure in the design of development which would encourage walking, cycling and likely improve general wellbeing. This type of infrastructure has a number of other benefits too. Blue infrastructure encourages urban water system interaction by promoting stream and river restorations, controlled storage areas, Sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) and the benefits of permeable paving.

Green infrastructure, green spaces and other environmental features can be designed into and managed as a multifunctional resource capable of delivering ecological services and quality of life benefits required by the communities it serves and needed to underpin sustainability.

We would encourage you to set out opportunities to create new habitats that will provide multiple benefits for example as part of green infrastructure, flood alleviation or SuDS. We would also like to see policies promoting Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) as the first method of surface water disposal and Green Infrastructure as part of this. We recommend you refer to the Biodiversity Planning Toolkit. The Toolkit provides information on the issues to be considered at the forward planning stage, including gathering a sufficient evidence base, biodiversity opportunity mapping, green infrastructure provision, setting spatial biodiversity objectives and targets and identifying potential for biodiversity enhancements. Green Infrastructure that contributes to protecting and enhancing water bodies (and the mechanisms required to deliver this) should form an integral part of the Local Plan. River corridors and networks of wildlife habitats could all be included and assessed as part of Green Infrastructure provision.

In summary we encourage you to consider including a policy to promote appropriate green and blue infrastructure in new development. This could include policies to require de-culverting, creation and management of ecological buffer strips and corridors, new wetland areas to help manage flood risk and reduce diffuse pollution whilst re-connecting people with nature.

Biodiversity Planning Tool Kit: http://www.biodiversityplanningtoolkit.com/
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Improving the provision of safe cycling routes and provision of public transport to the smaller settlements where residents often don't have or want their own vehicles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Bumpus

Section Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID 589

Comment More multi use pathways alongside roads, particularly linking with local schools and connecting outlying villages with market towns.
Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

2154

As set out in the Council's SA, a development strategy which provides for significant growth at Beccles supports the aspiration of promoting sustainable modes of transport by ensuring local services and facilities would be available to new developments within walking or cycling distance and/or by extending or enhancing existing bus services. The proposed development would provide for cycle routes to connect with the existing cycle network and would enable improved connections between the town and the Ellough Industrial Estate and Enterprise Zone, thereby helping to promote more sustainable options for travelling to work at the estate. Similarly, pedestrian routes within and adjoining the site would be enhanced. In addition, the development would make provision for enhancing and improving existing bus services in the area in order to provide a public transport service to/from the site and to connect with the town centre, the industrial estate and surrounding towns and villages. Furthermore, Larkfleet's proposed development offers the benefit of making provision for community facilities as an integral part of the development which would ensure future residents would be well-served by the services and facilities offered by the development itself. Likewise, these services would benefit those existing residents in the surrounding area and therefore promote a sustainable, walkable option for their service needs too.
Section Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID 1067

Comment In order to encourage sustainable transport choices, development needs to be situated where it is well located to public transport networks, encouraging a modal shift from private and single occupancy car journeys. The site at land to the south of Leisure Way is already well served by existing public transport links, being located opposite an existing bus stop on Leisure Way which provides regular services to a number of destinations including Lowestoft Town Centre, Great Yarmouth and Norwich. A number of key services and facilities are also within walking distance of the site such as Gunton Primary School and the Tesco Superstore. Allocating new development in sustainable locations such as this, is key to encouraging more sustainable transport choices and is in accordance with national planning policy contained within the NPPF to ensure that developments are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes maximised (paragraph 34). Therefore, the development of our client's site would encourage sustainable modes of travel.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID 1240

Comment In order to encourage sustainable transport choices, development needs to be situated where it is well located to public transport networks, encouraging a modal shift from private and single occupancy car journeys. The site at Lothingland Hospital is well served by existing public transport links. A number of key services and facilities are also located within walking and cycling distance of the site including a health centre, primary school, secondary school and supermarket. Allocating new development in sustainable locations such as this, is key to encouraging more sustainable transport choices and is in accordance with national planning policy contained within the NPPF to ensure that developments are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes maximised (paragraph 34). The development of our client's site would encourage sustainable modes of travel.
Haycock

**Section**

Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

**Comment ID**

896

**Comment**

Improved rail services and bus routes. Cycle paths should be genuine and not harvested from the roadside.
Section Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID 992

Comment I have witnessed very little cycling or walking provision when roads are upgraded. It is assumed that car is king but people are given no incentive for other modes of transport. In fact this lack of vision seems completely at odds with other areas including vast parts of London and Europe. At what point are we going to join in?
Anne McClarnon

Section Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID 663

Comment Much more could and should be done about both bus and rail options. The level (and cost) of bus services is a scandal. If a) more buses were available and b) the cost was proportionate to the length of journey that would help. Also, there seems to be a lack of understanding about travel patterns. To travel between Oulton Broad and Pakefield by bus is currently a nightmare and requires users to go into town and then change buses. Can’t there be better route planning?
We could also do with far more frequent rail services (and better trains) in the District. With that, the nightmare that is the delays in Oulton Broad really needs to be sorted out. This holds back the area and causes people to think twice about going there.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicky Elliott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID 422

Comment Charge levies for on street parking. This has got completely out of control in most areas with vehicles parked on pavements and commercial vans and lorries parked in suburban streets. I do not believe that the new cycle-ways are the answer because cycling on the footpaths (although illegal) has become the standard. Witness the High Street and Marine Parade.

Private vehicles will have to be restricted in Urban areas and access to buses and train services improved. The behaviour of people on public transport also needs to improve as this puts off people using these services. The encouragement of walking in the town centre should be further encouraged which will improve peoples health and well being and also improve footfall and access to the shops.
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

Section Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID 1183

Comment Only build housing where it is needed for employment
### North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Only build housing where there is employment opportunity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID 1670

Comment The cost of a bus journey into the town centre is too high and encourages people to use their cars instead of public transport. If we made all journeys one set amount, like many towns and cities do, people would be better encouraged to use the buses.
Jonathan Blankley

Section  Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID  53

Comment  Much of the traffic problems in Beccles arise from school runs, commuting and Saturday travel into town. This is further affected with the main north/south route going through the centre of the town. There is a lack of safe cycle routes both into town and to the High School, and some of the Primary Schools, resulting in higher car use. The town bus is ideal for pensioners who don't pay, but expensive for those who have to (£1.70 for a single from Beccles to Worlingham is more expensive than using the car). If a retail/leisure area were to be developed on the south east side of the town, then I would favour a park and ride scheme both for those who work in the town, but also as a link between that and the town centre. The southern link road may take some of the heavier through traffic out of the town centre, thus making it safer for both pedestrians and cyclists. Any new developments must improve the cycle routes, and a particular problem is Ellough Road from Rowan Way up to the industrial estate, as this is a fast but narrow road, and particularly unsafe for cyclists or pedestrians.
Cycling will increase if there is the political will, not if there isn't. Development is one of the best ways to provide cycling infrastructure as it can be built in from the concept stage of a development. Local cyclists should be included in discussions. Storage and parking of bicycles are very important. In residential developments, safe, weatherproof storage is necessary for each dwelling, preferably not communal, with easy access to the highway. Employees similarly look for secure weatherproof parking at their place of work. Visitors want parking which is convenient to their destination, preferably with under cover, and weatherproof if a visit is likely to be long. The parking compound at Lowestoft station is a good example of high-quality visitor parking.

There needs to be better co-ordination between buses and trains in Lowestoft, especially in the evening when both run at hourly but discordant intervals. The bus link from Halesworth to Southwold is a good example of what can be done with the will.

Regenerate the rail link to Lowestoft port so as to take freight off the roads.
Outside of Lowestoft, cycleway provision is poor. There needs to be proper investment in cycling not reliant on white lines in roads such as Lowestoft Road in Worlingham. Footpaths in town centres need to be widened so that pedestrians dominate rather than vehicular traffic. This will help maintain the quality of our urban Conservation Areas. There is a need for better traffic management in our town centres. There needs to be better links to the railways too. It is virtually impossible to get over the road at the roundabout with Station Road as a pedestrian. I know I did the original design brief but the mini-roundabout is past its sell by date!!
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section | Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?
Comment ID | 1925

Comment

In Southwold specifically, build an environmentally sensitive permanent car park on the Millennium Trust Field, and 21st century parking infrastructure throughout the town to limit car use; better directional and informational signage; an integrated approach to discourage car use and provide safe routes for cycling and walking; more cycle racks; and cycle hire facilities. In Southwold and Reydon, creating more all-weather mixed pedestrian/cycle routes that link development with the places that people want to go. The priority is a cycle/footpath linking St. Felix to Blyth Road, and to Southwold town centre. Sus trans should be involved in its design, and there should be consultation with land owners to see if additional land could be made available.

More generally,

• most new development actively encourages the use of cars. When any new development scheme is put forward it should be required to respond to best practice urban design guidance. Streets should be configured, and streetscapes designed so as to encourage walking and cycling. They need to be diverse, interesting, with landscapes, trees planted on the verges of streets, with front gardens that have space to create individualised gardens. There is plenty of good guidance out there— it is not being used.
• locating development near to shops or providing for small shopping areas within development.
• more public sector support for an integrated rural bus and rail service that incorporates transporting bicycles, and whose schedule is designed to enable people to commute to work, educational, and leisure facilities.
St John’s Hall Farms
Bidwells (John Long)

Section: Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?

Comment ID: 1388

Comment: St John’s Hall Farms considers that sustainable modes of transport can be encouraged by making it safe, convenient and affordable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Slater Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bidwells (John Long)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q20 How can sustainable modes of transport be encouraged?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The Slater Family considers that sustainable modes of transport can be encouraged by making it safe, convenient and affordable. The development of land to the rear of the High School enables a better solution for bus access to the High School. The roads around the school, particularly Kings Road and Queens Road currently suffer from congestion and traffic conflicts during school opening and closing times. The new access will alleviate the problems caused by school coaches and buses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

**Anonymous**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Beccles southern relief road to reduce HGVs in town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section      Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?
Comment ID  243
Comment      Better public transport: bus and train (Halesworth)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 309

Comment We need provision for elderly people - we're inundated. Maintain bus network.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Anonymous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Beccles needs all indoor / outdoor sports facilities + leisure facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1643

Comment Link road to take HGVs out of town [Beccles/Worlingham area]
**AP and AE Wolton**

**Section**

Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

**Comment ID**

1618

**Comment**

Light industrial development.
B A Crockford

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 226

Comment St James South Elmham already has a sewer and street lights. Broadband is being worked on.
B A Crockford

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 232

Comment A plan for major development must involve the provision of schools hospitals police water sewer and electricity as well as rail and major roads. The A12 is a disgrace it should be dualled.
Beccles & Bungay Cycle Strategy Sue Bergin

**Section**  
Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

**Comment ID**  
1021

**Comment**  
In particular is the need to connect Beccles with the Ellough Industrial Estate via the Ellough Road corridor. The Beccles Southern Relief Road will provide some cycling infrastructure but it will not continue alongside Benacre Road through the industrial estate and it does not help with the link into Beccles along Ellough Road. This is perhaps the single most needed piece of cycling infrastructure in the Beccles area.

In Bungay, Site 45 provides the opportunity to link Kings Road and the site with planning consent adjacent to the swimming pool to Meadow Road and Joyce Road. This is a much needed link and is already in use despite having to traverse a deep ditch and travel across the edge of an arable field.
Beccles and Bungay Cycle Strategy Ian Reid

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1178

Comment Safe pedestrian/cycle routes from Beccles/Worlingham to Ellough industrial estate. Proposed Southern relief road needs to provide cycling infrastructure alongside Benacre Road through the industrial estate. In Bungay a link from site 45 to Kings Road is required.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section  Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID  1096

Comment  It would be difficult to expand the roads infrastructure in Carlton Colville as houses are in the way. There is a problem with the road system leading to the primary school - the road system there was set out during the time of the horse and cart. Drainage needs to be greatly improved in order to stop the flooding that has been exacerbated by the tremendous increase in housing that has taken place in Carlton Colville over the past twenty years or so. Facilities for young adults should be provided, there is no youth club in Carlton Colville and young people feel that they are being ignored. The housing developments have houses with too little space around them for children or young adults to get fresh air. The open spaces that have been provided in Carlton Colville have run down equipment which is very poorly maintained and which only seem to serve dog walkers with dogs off their leads which can be quite often seen bounding over to little children followed by shouts of "it'll not harm you! (it only looks big and fierce)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Somerleyton - New village hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Public transport, roads, health sports playing fields indoor sports facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section | Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?
Comment ID | 177

Comment | Not convinced infrastructure is required but more 20 mph speed limits and measures to discourage car use, particularly the school run. Despite much vitriolic opposition, I support the proposal for a cycle bridge, but I think it should be for cyclists only. Pedestrians have the footways on the current Bascule bridge and Cycling UK policy is that sharing with pedestrians should be a last resort. Apart from the frictions that occur, Cyclists having to slow so much for pedestrians works against promoting cycling as a quicker transport mode for shorter journeys. There has been confusion with regard the sharing of the footways approaching and on the Bascule bridge. My understanding is that cyclists are now allowed to share the footways on the bridge. However, if the bridge became a reality I would be happy for that to be changed. Having said all this, if the third crossing comes, my previous suggestion of 'cyclists only' carriageways on the Bascule bridge would be far better and cheaper. the irony is that while acknowledging that would be a slight gain of a third crossing, overall I believe it is the most serious mistake being made in the history of Lowestoft.
**David Burman**

**Section**  
Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

**Comment ID**  
634

**Comment**

Improved road junctions on the main roads. Upgrade the sewage system, the water supply and broadband.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Debbie Read</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environment Agency

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 2100

Comment We are pleased to see that infrastructure has been considered and that this section of the plan does acknowledge the promotion of strategic flood risk defences in Lowestoft and that the local plan will continue to assist in the delivering some of these large scale projects. However one of our main focuses in this area would be the provision of waste water infrastructure and this has not yet been formally considered in this draft local plan. Paragraph 156 of the NPPF lists the provision of infrastructure of wastewater as one of the strategic priorities that should be considered in Local Plans.

Our water resources are critical to underpinning sustainable economic growth and housing development as well as supporting the natural environment. Increasing population and climate change will impact on the water resources in future. In considering your Local Plan you should take into account the ability of the existing wastewater treatment works and sewerage network to accommodate additional growth, having regard to both quality and capacity. Additional capacity may be required to serve the increased housing numbers. Where this is the case you should assess the impact it would have on the receiving water environment and practicalities of water companies providing necessary upgrades.

We would like to see a Local Plan policy that encourages all developments to connect to the public sewerage system rather than allowing a proliferation of private treatment plants. In several of the growth scenarios quoted, water recycling centres (WRC) will need to be upgraded and will need new environmental permits to operate at the higher volumes presented by new development. This will mean in turn an upgrading of the works to meet tighter water quality standards. WRC will require an upgrade under growth Option 2 with higher development proposed for Beccles and Worlingham. Lowestoft will require a new permit and possible upgrade for all of the growth scenarios. If rural development is undertaken around Worlingham, this will need a new permit and works upgrade too. Some other smaller works may need revised permits in response to rural development.

We would expect the Local Plan to consider the existing water and wastewater infrastructure and whether there is capacity for housing growth for the scenarios detailed in the Local Plan. The Local Plan will need to take
into account phasing of infrastructure or capacity which should be addressed by policies in affected settlements. Your planned Water Cycles Study (WCS) will help you address these issues and identify areas of concern and capacities. We suggested that all areas of proposed development are assessed as part of the WCS, for the numbers of proposed dwellings so that the impact of proposed development on water infrastructure can be assessed.

Catchment Delivery – WFD Waveney
The Local Plan will need to consider the impacts of planned growth on the Water Framework Directive (WFD). The WFD, through the River Basin Management Plans, sets out the environmental objectives which will need to be met for surface and ground water bodies. In addition, any opportunity to enhance the aquatic environment should be taken and enforced through the planning process, especially when watercourses are within allocated sites. Guidance has been produced that provides useful advice on how planning can help meet WFD objectives – Planning Advice for Integrated Water Management.

You will need to ensure that all of your plans and policies comply with the objectives of the WFD. This means that there must be no deterioration in WFD status for the Waveney catchment from the 2009 baseline despite the proposed increase in housing and jobs. Achieving a Good Ecological Status by 2027 or before must also not be compromised.

The Waveney is currently at Moderate Ecological Status. We have undertaken a cost-benefit analysis of achieving a good status and determined that the following measures are required to be delivered by relevant authorities to achieve this:

- Increase in-channel morphological diversity (river habitat enhancement and where possible, removal of hard engineered river banks)
- Phosphate status is Moderate so work is needed to improve phosphate status despite planned growth.
- Enable fish passage-removal of redundant in-channel structures or modification of existing structures to enable fish passage
- Riparian tree planting to provide additional habitat and enable the river and its tributaries to adapt to the changing climate.

We can provide you with additional guidance on this as the plan progresses.
Environment Agency

Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Lowestoft

The Lowestoft flood risk management strategy is investigating ways of reducing the tidal, fluvial and surface water flood risk to the town. It will be important to ensure the modelling and evidence base used through this project is utilised when understanding the flood risk to the town to ensure a consistent understanding of the flood risk. It will also be important to ensure that where there are opportunities to reduce the flood risk to existing development through planning policy for future development sites, these are pursued.

Carlton Colville and the Kirkley Stream in general are known to suffer from flooding from both the Kirkley Stream and surface water sources. The potential development sites numbered 34 & 35, as well as the much large proposal for residential development linking the A12 and the A146 could offer the opportunity to reduce the existing flood risk and implement some of the early concepts that have been produced for public consultation as part of the Lowestoft flood risk management strategy. In addition, the management of surface water from any future developments in this area will need to be strictly controlled, and ideally consider opportunities to reduce flood risk to existing communities. It will be essential for you to discuss this with Suffolk County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).

If a tidal barrier were to be constructed as a result of the Lowestoft flood risk management project the local plan will need to consider how the residual risk would be addressed. For example, were there to be a flood greater than designed for, or were the barrier fail to close, what risk would the town face, and how will your policies reflect this risk? What level of residual risk would the Council accept as being safe? As mentioned above, Ipswich Borough Council's Level 2 SFRA has produced a Safety Framework detailing the flood hazards that would be acceptable for different development vulnerabilities, which may be of interest. In addition, how will development in the town be considered in advance of the barrier being constructed? Ipswich Borough Council, as part of their SFRA and supporting policies, faced similar questions in relation to the construction of the Ipswich tidal barrier.
Environment Agency

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 2115

Comment Halesworth
Halesworth is a community that has suffered from flooding in the past (most notably in 1993). There is a site in the town centre at approximately TM3857477517 which is located on a flow pathway through the town during times of flood. The development of this site (with associated land raising and compensatory flood storage) could offer the potential to reduce the flood risk to the existing community. It is not currently shown as a potential land for development but we would be happy to provide further information if it were to be proposed for development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**        | Beccles  
The sites to the south of Beccles all appear to drain through the town to the north, so the management of surface water to ensure there is no increase to risk, but ideally improvements, will be important. Discussions with Suffolk County Council will therefore be important. |
**Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis**

**Section**

Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

**Comment ID**

1595

**Comment**

I live in Beccles and believe that flood defences are needed, and more cycle paths.
Graham Denny

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1564

Comment One vital and important element of the infrastructure for the Southwold and Reydon area is the disposal of surface water and sewage. Some 15 years ago it was recognised and accepted that the existing foul water and surface water drainage systems were inadequate and that improvements were necessary. In the last 15 years new properties and extensions to properties have been built but no improvements carried out. Planning consents have already been granted for properties in Southwold which will exacerbate the problem. Couple this with the more frequent extreme weather events and this is already leading to significant inadequacies.

The sewage system itself was considered not fit for purpose 15 years ago and nothing has been done to improve it. There is a sewage pumping station in Reydon which delivers effluent to the sewage works by 6 inch pumping main under Buss Creek. This pumping station will be unable to cope with the additional effluent from the additional projected housing stock unless major work is carried out to improve its capacity.

The basic requirements of this infrastructure need to be addressed and dealt with before any additional development is considered but I can find no evidence of this in the consultation document.
Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1533

Comment As already referred to in this submission, infrastructure is a serious impediment to any serious development in Halesworth. The development of employment opportunities in Halesworth is necessary if Halesworth is not to become a retirement town. There needs to be a strategy to attract business to the town, led by the District and County Councils. However, the provision of schools and medical facilities is also important and links with all residents. We have two Primary Schools, one of which is in Holton. Both are at capacity and both have recently undergone extensive expansion after the abolition of the middle school tier in Suffolk. There is no Secondary School. Pupils have to be bussed in to Bungay. Parents do not necessarily want their children spending hours on buses each day. Cutlers Hill Surgery serves the town and many outlying parishes. They have 11,000 patients now. This is important. The nearest hospital is 30 miles away. The Patrick Stead hospital is threatened with closure. A new facility is needed with facilities currently offered by the hospital. The sewage system is need of updating and there are issues regarding flooding and water run off. The potential risk of flooding in the town was highlighted last winter, when the water level in the town rose considerably. Action needs to taken up stream from the town needs to diminish the risk of flooding.
Ian King

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 555

Comment Lowestoft needs new bridge near Wickes.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1715

Comment A bus link a couple of time a week to Bungay & Beccles and re-thinking the Bungay one-way system.
James Toole

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 195

Comment Much improved cycleways, new direct well maintained routes. Better sporting facilities including hockey pitches and pool.
John Bumpus

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 590

Comment Some spending outside of Lowestoft would be a start. In order to encourage sustainable transport, improve health, promote safety and tourism, a multi use path should be provided alongside the B1062 between Beccles and Bungay.
**John and Barbara Carter**

**Section**  
Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

**Comment ID**  
1513

**Comment**  
The main roads providing access to Reydon and Southwold would need to be improved, as would the local roads. With the current levels of population there is already inadequate parking available in both Southwold and Reydon. On occasions this restricts traffic flow and creates potential for accidents.
**Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Historically Kessingland is made up of two separate communities – The Beach and the Street, each with their own schools. This remained the case until the early 1960’s when the land in between the two communities was developed with approximately 600 houses, which doubled the size of the village and merged it into one community.  
The community today have to live the legacy of poor infrastructure, from the layout of roads, health, education, sewerage/foul water drainage, transport and retails outlets.  
The Neighbourhood Planning Team when preparing the Neighbourhood Plan were very much aware of the problems when drawing up draft policies to cover housing, transport, business and employment, leisure facilities, environment, tourism and flooding/drainage. These are reflected in the draft policies SA1, SA2 and SA3 and will provide the Community with a foundation upon which the future of Kessingland will develop. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th><strong>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td><strong>1653</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Parking is an issue, particularly in Southwold, and a significant number of new homes will make this worse (bearing mind Southwold has the only local supermarkets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Larkfleet Homes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seth Williams</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section**  | Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?  
**Comment ID** | 2155  
**Comment**  | It is apparent from our public and stakeholder engagement to date that the delivery of a primary school, playing fields and public open space would be appropriate as part of Larkfleet's proposed development and would be welcomed by local residents. Discussions with healthcare providers are ongoing and appropriate provision could also be made in this regard arising from the projected needs identified by the local Clinical Commissioning Group. However, aside from these identified matters, Beccles is considered to benefit from good existing infrastructure which therefore means that a strategy promoting growth at Beccles is readily deliverable and achievable. Conversely, the focusing of a substantial proportion of development at Lowestoft would have potential to be constrained, both in financial terms and the delivery timescale, by the need to deliver significant infrastructure improvements to support it – i.e. the provision of a new road to link the A12 and A146 to the south of Lowestoft.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Our client's site is sustainably located to utilise existing infrastructure. No new significant infrastructure would therefore be required to support residential development in this location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

The historic and current uses on the site mean that it is well served by existing infrastructure. It is anticipated that any future residential development would be able to utilise this existing infrastructure. Capacity studies will be undertaken as part of any development proposal however it is not expected that any new significant infrastructure would be required to support residential development on this previously developed site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment ID</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>Health services - doctors / dentists/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lowestoft & Waveney Chamber of Commerce Linda Thornton

Section  Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID  2234

Comment  At a meeting of our Board in March 2014 we agreed a number of transport and infrastructure priorities relevant to the current consultation, as well as confirming strong LWCoC support for the proposed new crossing over Lake Lothing. Those most relevant to the current consultation are:

> Remove the constraints to economic and employment development within the areas designated through; the Lowestoft Lake Lothing & Outer Harbour Area Action Plan; and the Gt Yarmouth and Lowestoft Enterprise Zone. As a particular priority kept under review, and challenge if appropriate, the current balance between industrial and housing allocations where the former will make a more significant contribution to economic and employment growth.

> As a matter of high priority, widen the port access channel in the vicinity of the existing bascule bridge in order to stimulate offshore and marine-based economic activity on the allocated land to its west.

> Support improvements to the A146 between Barnby and Carlton Colville to improve access to the section of the Enterprise Zone at Ellough Business Park.

> Support the proposed Lowestoft flood defence scheme aimed at protecting the built, road and rail infrastructure from the adverse effects of tidal, pluvial and fluvial flooding.

> Ensure that services to all employment sites are adequate for present and future needs, to include electrical supplies, broadband and access to mobile technologies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lynette Meen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michael Archer

Section: Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID: 1638

Comment: Yet another "plan" that is going to cost a fortune, and then disappear into obscurity, various "interested parties" then also disappear, they are known as "planning fat cats"! Whatever happened to the Beccles bypass plan? What improvements have been made to the A12, A14 & A47 promised over the last 15 years to my knowledge. I would say that at least 75% of people who get involved in all these "plans" never see them - The Government, Councils etc are only interested in money! Trust me, I've seen this maturing for some 30/40 years now!
Haycock

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 897

Comment Medical Centre.

Note: Due to housing developments in Worlingham between 2001 and 2011, the percentages of residents in the two age ranges 65-74 and 75+ increased by 27.4% and 60% respectively.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 664

Comment We really need to sort out the level crossings in Oulton Broad and speed up traffic flows in that area. Building cycle bridges are great (and I'm in favour), but sorting out the existing road delays and providing some alternatives to roundabout and traffic light delays would be even more beneficial.
As for flood risk, there is frequent flooding in Nicholas Everitt Park and Bridge Road. The drains put in following changes to Mutford Lock currently don't cope well: it's time this was sorted, especially if more development is planned for Lake Lothing and the Oulton Broad area.
Nicky Elliott

Section   Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID   963

Comment   Measures included in the Waveney Cycling Strategy. In particular, a safe cycling route is needed between Beccles and the Ellough Industrial estate to encourage sustainable transport choices. At present Ellough Road and Benacre Road are dangerous on a bicycle, and although cycling infrastructure is planned to be built alongside the Southern Relief Road, there seem to be no plans for this to be continued along the Ellough and Benacre Roads.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
<td>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>More off street parking areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Doctors, dentists, teachers, better roads, better rail services, more police.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1671

Comment

The Oulton and Oulton Broad area need improvements to road junctions at the following locations:
- Gorleston Road/Dunston Drive
- Gorleston Road/Sands Lane
- Gorleston Road/Hall Road
- Gorleston Road/Mobbs Way

These need to be put in place as soon as possible as the number of cars will steadily increase with the ongoing Woods Meadow development. Even with improvements to the above junctions, the traffic heading south would still suffer delays due to navigating the railway crossing and the Mutford Lock Bridge in Bridge Road, Oulton Broad. Promised improvements to reduce the waiting time at Oulton Broad North railway station are long overdue. When the improvements are carried out, traffic delays will be reduced.

Signage is required, with enforceable actions, to direct HGV's away from Oulton Street, which is a 20mph zone and is too narrow to accommodate the large vehicles safely.

Oulton needs a medical centre as the recent closure of the Oulton Medical Centre has led to patients having to join already overcrowded GP surgeries and having to wait an unacceptable amount of time to see a medical professional.

The ongoing development at Woods Meadow will add to the infrastructure problems in and around Oulton. The proposed primary school on the development will not be built for at least four years, by which time there will be many children living on the new estate with no local school able to accommodate them.

The closest, already overstretched, medical centres will not be able to accommodate the residents from the new homes.

The Community Centre in Oulton is almost fully booked every day so will not be able to accommodate residents from the new development.

We would respectfully remind the planning authority that the section 106 agreement for the Woods Meadow Development includes a Highway Review Bond of one million pounds. The document states that highway review shall be undertaken on occupation of the 400th dwelling and that the County Council shall have ultimate discretion to call on the amount of
the highway review bond it deems suitable for the carrying out of the highway review works.

We feel that the time to call in the highway review bond is now. We were told by a planning officer at a recent WLP meeting, that any planning development will not be approved if the infrastructure is not in place. If this is the case, then the improvements, utilising the highway review bond, should proceed as soon as possible.
Pamela Cyprien

Section  Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID  1262

Comment  In 2009 it was made clear that our sewerage/drainage system in Reydon and Southwold was not fit for purpose, yet more houses have been built putting strain on an already inadequate system. The treatment centre more often than not smells horrible and sewage is often released into The Blythe. Drains often flood from excessive surface water. Through climate change we are experiencing heavy/torrential rain more frequently. During holiday periods, the roads through Reydon into Southwold are often congested and strain is put on parking facilities. This makes it difficult for local people to move around.

More housing will add to the problem, especially if holiday homes. Bus services are also being cut which adds to the problem.
Pamela Morris

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 560

Comment People are asking for high speed broadband. Modern street furniture is not suited to the ethos of Southwold + Reydon.
Jonathan Blankley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The southern relief road, joined up cycle routes to schools and the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Cockerton and Karen Evans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Halesworth – secondary school; hospital facilities; swimming pool; leisure centre; off road bus stop in centre of town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peter Cockerton and Karen Evans

Section  Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID  1589

Comment  Halesworth is a long distance from any general Hospital and at present there is no direct public transport. This is a problem for many people. Also there need to be facilities close to home for rehabilitation and convalescence.
Peter Eyres

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1416

Comment I support the proposed cycle bridge over Lake Lothing, which should be continued over the railway line; the cutting west of the footbridge would allow a crossing with minimum of earthworks. This would also require a cycle track on the high ground beside the railway through development site 53 to Harbour Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>john norris</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>the southern relief road with a descent link road for traffic going west on the a143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robert Williamson

Section  Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID  505

Comment  You have on your plan for up to 140 houses to be built off Wisset road in Halesworth and Wisset Street all the cars have to get out at the junction of Norwich Road Halesworth this can now take up to 20 mins at school times so if you add 140 houses thats a min of 140 cars a solution will have to be found. could be round about traffic lights or open gates in old station road
russell martin

Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1365

Comment

The infrastructure in Reydon and Southwold supports an area which has a high number of ‘second homers’. The shops are kept running by tourists drawn in by the charm of the place. The water treatment works are always under significant pressure in the peak season and I have doubts that it will cope with extra demands put on it by any significant house building. Local knowledge and comment indicate that the current provision is indeed running at capacity in the peak season. Please treat with suspicion comments that are based on averages and not maximum peaks. The road leading from the A12 into Reydon is not good and there is a history of accidents and fatalities. It would not be sensible to increase the population, beyond a small number, without considering the requirement to improve access to the main A12.
Sarah Cross

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 130

Comment Parking for householders now parking all over green verges. Schools here are rubbish more houses need more schools. If you can’t get good teachers for these schools how do you get good teachers for new schools! Stop building houses near new bypass roads what’s the point of better roads if you clog them up with more houses!!! 4 lanes over bridge +/or bridge over train line.
No more traffic lights - people crossing ones roads need to be better to encourage bigger businesses here! Bigger shop names and more industry to let Lowestoft grow otherwise it will + already maybe just a town of retirement and benefits. More work needed here.
Simon Clack

Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

1649

The traffic congestion that afflicts Southwold is spreading to Reydon. It would be fabulous if a safe and comprehensive network of cycle paths could be established to coax people out of their cars and cycle to work, to the shops, to schools, to the Health Centre, etc. Waveney needs a cycling revolution similar to that seen in the Netherlands in the 1970s.
Southwold & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce Guy Mitchell

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1691

Comment Southwold Town Centre
Parking
Parking has for many years been an issue in Southwold. The plan provides an opportunity to address some of the issues however it is naïve to think that it is an opportunity to solve all of the problems associated with parking Any move to introduce parking restrictions to guarantee residents parking should be carefully managed. With limited resources, it is crucial that these resources are used to maximum benefit for both residents and for the visitors to the town who are so important to the local economy. To introduce resident's bays, many of which may be unused for long periods of time (by second home owners on the electoral roll), may be good for residents but will exacerbate parking problems within the town and cause significant economic damage.
Careful consideration should also be given to any proposal to pedestrianise the High Street. While this may appear sensible in summer months, and prove popular with cafes and restaurants, consideration should be given to the loss of valuable parking spaces (which retailers depend upon) and a lack of vitality during quieter times in the majority of the year.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section  Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID  1286

Comment  The road network around Southwold and Reydon is adequate for the current size of the settlements but not suitable for any significant growth, The sewage infrastructure (as confirmed by the 2009 report) is at or beyond its capacity - a factor that should strongly restrict identification of sites for any major development in our area. Parking is out of control in Southwold and all planning policies must seek to provide adequate off-street parking and support better management of parking.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1926

Comment We note that whilst big infrastructure projects in the pipeline, such as Lake Lothing Crossing, Beccles Relief Road and Lowestoft Flood Protection, are highlighted, no reference is made to the “hidden” infrastructure of electricity and water supply, telecommunications, surface and foul water drainage or wastewater treatment, all of which are essential to support communities and help them in their day to day lives. It is acknowledged that the responsibility for such infrastructure rests largely with the private sector providers, but it behoves public sector planners to liaise with the private sector providers to ensure that housing developments proceed at a rate that does not exceed the capacity of the private sector to provide. The most pressing need is for improved waste water drainage and treatment; but also, as discussed above, we need sustainable transport infrastructure to reduce car use. The latter includes an additional safe cycling route to link Southwold and Reydon; parking and cycling infrastructure in Southwold and Reydon.

Regarding the former, Section 5.2.4 of Waveney DC & Great Yarmouth BC – Joint Water Cycle Strategy, Final Scoping Report, published in 2009 when the current Local Plan was being developed states "Southwold (with Reydon) WwTW (serving PE of 9,700) is also identified in this document as having very limited capacity available and requiring investment before any future growth".

Since 2012, we have had additional new build in Southwold of over 40 units (Tibby’s Triangle; Stable Yard; the Smoke House development on East Street; Fieldstile Road; British Legion). Plus, Duncan’s Yard and the Service Station are coming on-stream with an additional 33 units. This does not include conversions that increase the number of occupants. In the past 12 months alone, planning applications that increase habitable space have been submitted at a rate of about two per month in each of Southwold and Reydon.

All of this development has taken its toll on the WwTW system. There is reliable anecdotal evidence of drainage back-ups. For example, during the past three years, the allotments alongside Blyth Road in Southwold have been flooded five times due to breakdowns in wastewater pumps and consequential failure of the gravity fed main; 0.7% of respondents to the Southwold Town Plan questionnaire reported that their property suffered...
from flooding, drainage problems or sewerage backup caused by surface water or pump failure often and 10% sometimes; and a resident of Victoria Road in Southwold reports that she has sewage back-up during the high season when holiday let accommodation near-by is fully occupied. With the new Local Plan, depending on which growth and distribution scenario is used, the number of additional houses for S & R would be a minimum of 231 and a maximum of 571. None of this should go forward without substantial improvements to the WsTW. The drainage reticulation appears to be a hybrid mixture of single (surface or foul water) and combined (surface and foul water) pipes, with responsibilities divided between Anglian Water (roof water run-off and foul water) and Suffolk CC Highways (road surface run-off). We are embarking on an investigation to identify specific problems and their locations preparatory to meeting Anglian Water and SCC Highways and will keep you informed of our findings and progress. In the meantime, we would urge you to recognise and acknowledge the perilous state of our "hidden" infrastructure and to incorporate plans and policies in the new Waveney Local Plan to address the potential problems facing Southwold and Reydon if the infrastructure is not improved as a matter of urgency.
St James South Elmham Parish Meeting Mary Henry

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 809

Comment Most important has been, and continues to be, timely availability of high-speed broadband without which rural communities and their businesses are increasingly unable to function. The Better Broadband Suffolk project had our village, along with others in a similar position, failing the economic model on which service provision is determined with a likely service availability date for not much more than 2Mbps of beyond 2020. Determined action by the village working with Openreach has brought fibre into the village resulting in overwhelming demand from residents and businesses. Local transport infrastructure depends wholly on the rural road network: proper, timely maintenance of this to remove potholes and the provision of more passing places are the major infrastructure issues, far more important than more roads.
St John's Hall Farms
Bidwells (John Long)

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1389

Comment St John’s Hall Farms considers that Bungay’s education provision is a key part of the Town’s infrastructure and need to be supported and allowed to prosper. New homes will provide the pupils needed to sustain the schools, and schools will need to expand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Stephen Read</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Susan Harrison

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 2187

Comment Redisham
None, local services serve the village well.
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 1524

Comment
There is a need for increased educational provision to supplement the loss of our Middle School and to attract young families to Halesworth. The WDC Green Infrastructure Strategy July 2015 identified that "Halesworth has the poorest access to sports facilities in this part of the District" The approval, construction and financial support should be a priority if National Government guidelines on Health and Wellbeing are to be supported. 
The threat of closure of our hospital will impact on health care unless a new facility is built with community beds allocated as currently exist in Patrick Stead Hospital.

Our road infrastructure should be reviewed and Phase 2 of the relief road should be revisited before any new developments are designated.

The promotion and encouragement to bring employment to Halesworth is a vital link in preventing Halesworth from becoming a 'retirement town'.

There seems to be no cohesive strategy to bring new businesses to the Town.
The sewage system is operating at near maximum capacity at times and should be expanded to contend with any new housing. A review of the current flooding problems have identified the need for remedial action upstream of the bridge in the Thoroughfare Halesworth and if we are to prevent another flood in the Town urgent action should be taken.
The Slater Family
Bidwells (John Long)

Section Q21 What infrastructure is required in your area?

Comment ID 2227

Comment The Slater Family considers that Bungay's education provision is a key part of the Town's infrastructure and needs to be supported and allowed to prosper. New homes will provide the pupils needed to sustain the schools, and schools will need to expand. The development of land to the rear of the High School includes provision for the High School to expand,
Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Anonymous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>New development to include open spaces and landscaping with trees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 244

Comment If substantial growth: definitely extra health care, education, transport, leisure facilities, traffic and parking (Halesworth)
Anonymous

Section  Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID  295

Comment  Leisure facilities, hospital, larger doctors surgery. Stop charging for 1st hours car parking Waveney! Stop the cuts to NHS and public sector.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Anonymous**

**Section** | Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?
---|---
**Comment ID** | 329
**Comment** | Better concern for cycle connections between rural areas such as Bungay - Halesworth. Transport, with bus development being backed up with road improvements.
Anonymous

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 336

Comment Adequate utilities and broadband.
**Anonymous**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The sites identified in Oulton are wholly unsuitable because of the roads, with the Woods Meadow development of 800 properties the impact on Oulton will be enormous for roads never built for this volume of traffic. We need no more large sites until this is improved. Whichever way the traffic goes it still has to access and ingress highly congested roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section  
Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID  
1581

Comment  
Can't grow until the roads and services are vastly improved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AP and AE Wolton

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 1619

Comment Widen Wrentham to Southwold access to improve traffic flow.
Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council S H Read

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 1405

Comment The Parish Council is extremely concerned about safety on the B1074 and its increasing use by heavy goods vehicles plus more and more cars and cycles. It believes that safety should be improved urgently before many more houses are completed at Woods Meadow and certainly before any further housing development occurs in North Lowestoft. The Parish Council suggests that this road should retain its rural characteristics in the main and that heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited. When considering potential development in the three parishes it is important to note that there is currently little employment and limited public transport.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B A Crockford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 2005

Comment Q21-22. Your own analysis raises doubts over the ability of the waste water infrastructure for Beccles and Bungay to cope with any significant additional development. And an early investigation of this is essential with the likely cost of any upgrade being identified, so that it can be costed in to the evaluation of development sites in the area. School planning will need careful thought, especially with the additional availability of "free school" places. Any significant additional development around the south side of Beccles should include some shopping provision and community facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The link between Beccles and the Ellough industrial estate is vital to connect employment areas with residential areas for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beccles and Bungay Cycle Strategy Ian Reid

Section  Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID  1179

Comment  Beccles to Ellough industrial estate pedestrian/cycle link to connect work areas with residential areas.
Beccles Society Paul Fletcher

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 1402

Comment If Beccles was to grow, one suggestion for new infrastructure would be a mini "Park and Ride" scheme as there will be insufficient car parking spaces in the centre to cater for the demand once a significant number of new properties are built. There is currently no land available in the centre of Beccles for the construction of more car parks. New Supermarkets, Leisure and Health facilities should be built within proposed significant housing developments as Beccles has a sufficient number of supermarkets already and the existing highway network and car parking facilities would be extremely difficult to improve.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 1097

Comment Improved drainage.
Improved roads where possible
Facilities for young people
Keep character of the place
**chris Morris**

**Section**

Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

**Comment ID**

1607

**Comment**

Somerleyton - Buses! School expansion, mobile phone signal!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTC John Thompson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David Burman

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 635

Comment Road improvement, plus upgrading sewage and water supply, plus electricity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Bungay - roads - car parks! please.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Essex & Suffolk Water

Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 2217

Comment

Essex & Suffolk Water (ESW) has a statutory duty to prepare and maintain a Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) under the Water Resources Management Plan Regulations 2007. Our WRMP shows how we intend to maintain the balance between supply and demand over the next 25 years (2015 to 2040) and can be found on our website: https://www.eswater.co.uk/your-home/current-WRMP.aspx

Our WRMP covers the entire ESW customer supply area. For the purposes of the Company’s demand forecasts and supply demand balance calculations, the supply area has been split into four Water Resource Zones (WRZ), namely Essex, Suffolk Northern Central, Suffolk Blyth and Suffolk Hartismere.

Beccles with Worlingham, Bungay, Halesworth, Southwold with Reydon, Kessingland, Barnby/North Cove, Blundeston, Corton, Holton, Wangford and Wrentham are all located within our Suffolk Northern Central Water Resource Zone.

Page 349 of our WRMP shows a Supply Demand Balance and a Balance of Supply graph for the Suffolk Northern Central WRZ. These illustrate a supply surplus over the extent of the planning horizon. The supply surplus (mega litres (ML) per day) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th>End of AMP5</th>
<th>End of AMP6</th>
<th>End of AMP7</th>
<th>End of AMP8</th>
<th>End of AMP9</th>
<th>End of Planning Horizon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For local planning purposes, the Balance of Supply (including headroom) should be used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section: Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID: 556

Comment: The usual.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Improvement in public transport including the train link from Norwich to London.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
James Toole

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 196

Comment Much improved cycleways, new direct well maintained routes. Better sporting facilities including hockey pitches and pool.
John Bumpus

Section           Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID       591

Comment          Without the third crossing most development should be to the north of Lake Lothing.
John and Barbara Carter

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 1514

Comment The main roads providing access to Reydon and Southwold would need to be improved, as would the local roads. With the current levels of population there is already inadequate parking available in both Southwold and Reydon. On occasions this restricts traffic flow and creates potential for accidents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We are concerned about the impact of providing new homes will have on the existing infrastructure, in particular regarding the existing sewage treatment facilities as we understand that minor problems have already occurred in some areas of Reydon. It is necessary to consider the impact that increased population will have on schools, medical facilities and transport in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette Meen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Beccles/Worlingham - doctors, better roads, pub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anne McClaron</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Sustainable transport links between housing and retail/employment centres. Also, we must ensure that flood risk is considered well, given the proximity of the River Waveney and other water courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NHS Great Yarmouth and Waveney Clinical Commissioning Group Fran O’Driscoll

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 1471

Comment Thank you for consulting NHS Great Yarmouth and Waveney Clinical Commissioning Group (the NHSGY&WCCG) on the above options for the Waveney Local Plan to 2036 (the Local Plan).

In reviewing the content, context and options available, the following comments in regard to Health and Social Care access and provision across Great Yarmouth and Waveney on behalf of the CCG.

Existing Healthcare Provision in Waveney

Currently, within Waveney, there is a good and proportionate level of healthcare coverage however we appreciate the need to further develop the area and therefore are keen to participate as your consultation progresses and we understand from the 'plan our future' there will be further consultations in Late spring 2017 and a final consultation in autumn 2017.

The Local Plan must take into account both the capacity and locations of the existing Healthcare infrastructure when considering both options for the scale and location of growth within the region.

The proposed growth across the region will have a significant impact upon the future Healthcare provision. Existing Primary Care capacity is constantly under review and capacity will be reviewed to accommodate significant growth in the medium to long term. Capacity is being reviewed across a number of key variables; Weighted List vs. Capacity, GP Recruitment, Retention & succession planning, and size and quality of facilities.

The CCG are currently working towards an overarching Strategic Estates Plan, and are bidding for funding to support Primary Care capacity and resilience in the region success of these bids will be known by September 2016.

Existing health infrastructure will require further investment and improvement in order to meet the needs of the options for growth shown in the Local Plan consultation document. The developments contained within would have an impact on health provision in the area and its implications, if unmitigated, would be unsustainable.

Identification and Assessment of Policies and Strategies that have Healthcare Implications

In the further development of the Local Plan, care should be taken to
ensure that the four strategic outcomes of the Suffolk Health and Wellbeing Plan are taken into consideration throughout the process, and there is no adverse impact upon Healthcare provision. Accordingly, in instances where development is planned in locations where healthcare service capacity is insufficient to meet the augmented needs, appropriate mitigation must be considered as part of any approvals processes. Policies should be explicit in that contributions towards healthcare provision will be obtained and the Local Planning Authority will consider a development’s sustainability with regard to continued effective healthcare provision.

The exact nature and scale of the contribution (and the subsequent expenditure by NHS England) will be calculated at an appropriate time as and if schemes come forward over the plan period to realise the objectives of the Local Plan.

As part of the Local Plan consultation, the Local Planning Authority should have reference to the most up-to-date strategy documents from NHS England and the CCG which currently include; The Sustainability and Transformation Plan. The Five Year Forward View, the GP forward view and the local NHSGY&WCCG Strategic Estates Plan.

Within the Local Plan (and subsequent developments) care should be taken to ensure commitments made are not in any way prescriptive or binding on the CCG or NHS England to carry out certain development within a set timeframe, and do not give undue commitment to projects.

Notwithstanding the above, there should be a reasonably worded policy within the Local Plan that indicates a supportive approach from the Local Planning Authority to the improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical/health facilities. This positive stance should also be indicated towards assessing those schemes for new bespoke medical facilities where such facilities are agreed to in writing by the NHSGY&WCCG and NHS England. New facilities will only be appropriate where they accord with the latest up-to-date NHS England and NHSGY&WCCG strategy documents and are responding to an appropriate need.

We note the requirement for Waveney District Council to deliver a plan for increased levels of housing growth for their area, resulting in between 7,700 and 9,525 new dwellings by 2036 and have identified the anticipated impact on infrastructure arising from these proposals.

As stated above the exact nature and scale of mitigation required to meet augmented needs of proposed developments will be calculated at an appropriate time, as and if schemes come forward over the plan period to realise the objectives of the Local Plan. As yet we understand no decisions
have been made as to where the growth is likely to occur hence two further consultations will take place in 2017. As and when you are aware then we would welcome further details so we can respond.

Conclusions
This response is on behalf of NHSGY&W CCG consultation period 22nd April- 17th June 2016. Provision needs to be made within the emerging 'local plan' to address the impacts of development on health infrastructure and to ensure cost effective delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements in the interests of sustainable developments.

As previous NHSGY&W CCG support the growth required for the Waveney area however further consultation and dialogue will be required once further details are available and through the consultations set out for 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicky Elliott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 424

Comment Re - open the Lowestoft to Yarmouth railway line to encourage the combined use of the two towns port facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Third crossing. Make Waveney an attractive place to live again to encourage the much needed doctors, dentists, teachers and tourists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We do not believe that Oulton can grow any further after the 800 homes at Woods Meadow. The road infrastructure is inadequate and even with the required improvements to the junctions already mentioned, it would be unable to accommodate any further housing development. Improvements to Oulton Broad North railway crossing to reduce the amount of time the line gates are down would help to reduce traffic queues significantly. The third river crossing would reduce journey times and traffic queues, which in turn may help to attract businesses to the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Morris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Large scale development is not needed, hence no more infrastructure apart from high speed broadband.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section  Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID  55

Comment  More facilities to the South East of Beccles/Worlingham that would compliment, but reduce the pressure on the town centre.
Peter Cockerton and Karen Evans

Section  
Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID  
1587

Comment  
As q6 [Halesworth – secondary school; hospital facilities; swimming pool; leisure centre; off road bus stop in centre of town.]; more car parking spaces; improved road network.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>1366</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The two main food shops struggle to meet demand in peak times now. Further 'food' retail outlets, of an appropriate 'small' size, would be required. The road system will require attention. The water treatment works will require upgrading. Some of these required changes will be detrimental to the current character of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No more in Beccles – too many new houses none should be built on flood plains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sarah Cross**

**Section**  
Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

**Comment ID**  
138

**Comment**  
Must be aware of new developments - cycle paths, parking for cars, bus routes, parks for kids - green spaces!
Southwold & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce Guy Mitchell

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 1693

Comment The current infrastructure of the area will struggle to accommodate increased housing stock. We would need to be satisfied that provision of schools, healthcare and sewerage could meet the needs of an expanding population. In addition, any expansion of Reydon would be likely to increase pressure on the already stretched parking provision in Southwold.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

**Section**
Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

**Comment ID**
1927

**Comment**
See above (Q21), plus better broadband, mobile phone connections, and public transport links to Norwich, Ipswich and London – each infrastructure related.
### St James South Elmham Parish Meeting Mary Henry

**Section**

Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

**Comment ID**

810

**Comment**

Most of the growth options, including our preferred Option 2, have a suggested rural contribution of 5%. Taking your mid-growth scenario (Scenario 2), your table suggests this would result in some 223 additional homes in the rural area of Waveney. St James has 88 homes at present, about 1% of the rural housing stock of 8,427, suggesting a growth plan for the village of some 2 – 3 homes over the life of the plan. At this level, and apart from the broadband issue discussed above, it is unlikely that any additional infrastructure would be needed.
Stephen Read

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 252

Comment Leisure/Doctors/School access (Bungay)
**Suffolk County Council James Cutting**

**Section**

Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

**Comment ID**

2176

**Comment**

Education

The county council has a legal duty to ensure provision of education from ages 2 to 16. The National Planning Policy Framework (paras. 38, 72, 203-204) establishes a role for the planning system in ensuring that provision can be met, in resolving issues before planning applications come forward and in locating schools so as to minimise the need for travel, especially by private car. Safe routes to school are necessary; otherwise the education authority must bear the cost of school transport.

The scale and distribution of housing growth proposed can be managed in relation to school places. However, there are different implications arising from different options that then impact on the cost of providing the necessary infrastructure and the funding mechanisms (e.g. CIL or s106) required in order that sufficient places can be provided.

Early-years education, primary and secondary school requirements are set out in broad terms below based on the standard pupil multipliers, which are set out in the Suffolk Section 106 Developers Guide. The actual need for places will depend on the location of development, the forecast pupil numbers and the capacity available. Further detail will be provided to Waveney District Council as it forms its Local Plan and the county council aims to be an active partner in this regard.

In considering the impact of different scales and patterns of development on the provision of education facilities, the county council has included developments that have been permitted up to September 2015 for secondary and January 2016 for primary. The illustrated impact on secondary is set out in appendix 2. The position for primary education will be explored in detail as the document develops and the county council will continue to assist Waveney District Council with this process.

Sixth Form pupils are likely to attend the sixth form college in Lowestoft. Based on existing capacity and current forecasts, the college should be able to accommodate an additional 200 pupils from the Lowestoft developments plus those from Lake Lothing.

Lowestoft

An additional 5,239 to 7,144 dwellings is expected to generate demand for the following minimum pupil places:
Early Years (2-5): 524-714
Primary (5-11): 1310-1786
Secondary (11-16): 943-1286
Sixth Form (16+): 210-286

Early Years
Currently, there is high demand for early education places in Lowestoft. Additional growth will increase the need for additional places as well as offering the opportunity to support existing local provision (where capacity exists).

Primary
Forecasts indicate that there is limited capacity of primary places in Lowestoft over the next few years. Future growth, in addition to existing and planned housing developments, will require new primary provision in Lowestoft. If the proposed developments to the north and south of Lowestoft come forward, new primary schools to address the needs of these developments would need to be planned into the developments at an early stage.

Secondary
Based on the forecasts (appendix 2), the following conclusions can be made on secondary education:
– Ormiston Denes Academy and East Point Academy have capacity to accommodate additional pupils based on the proposed level of growth in their catchment and on top of the currently allocated development at the Brook Marina of 850 new dwellings and Carlton Hall Farm with 130 dwellings. In the long-term, the Benjamin Bitten High School will require expansion to cope with the future need of additional pupil places.
– Pakefield School is close to capacity and any future growth will need to entail a detailed discussion with the school about future requirements.

Beccles and Worlingham
An additional 953 to 2,381 dwellings is expected to generate demand for the following minimum pupil places.
Early Years (2-5): 95-238
Primary (5-11): 238-595
Secondary (11-16): 172-429
Sixth Form (16+): 38-95
Early Years
Whilst there are some spaces available, these are limited and may be taken up in the coming years. East Coast Health Care are developing a new nursery but, as yet, the opening date is unknown. It is reasonable to assume that at least three new settings would be required. These may be alongside a new primary school, within new developments (if large enough) or within the town, including the town centre. Planning policies, including retail, should enable such provision.

Primary
Depending on the level of growth, a new primary school may be required on one of the sites that are selected. If local capacity is constrained and a higher level of growth is proposed, two new schools may be required. In selecting the sites, care will need to be taken to consider the degree to which the new school can be delivered and that the new school(s) are located in optimum position(s) to maximise trips by sustainable modes.

Secondary
The scale of the proposed development at Beccles is likely to result in the need for further increases in capacity at the local secondary schools. The limited capacity at Sir John Leman High School will need to be carefully considered as the local plan progresses. If the majority of the proposed growth is to be implemented, discussions will need to be held with the schools so that an agreed strategy can be formed - the county council will assist with this process. Mitigation measures might include phased future building programmes or other solutions.

Whilst home-school distance is a factor in its admissions policy, Beccles Free School does not have a defined catchment. In producing forecasts, no pupils resulting from future development are allocated to this school although, clearly, some of the new pupils will attend the school (reducing the need for additional investment). Working with the school and Waveney District Council, the county council will review the forecast impact.

There is currently high demand for education places in Beccles arising from pupils outside the local school catchment areas (as noted above, pupils from Lowestoft travel to Beccles to attend Beccles Free School and Sir John Leman High School). Additional pupils arising from housing growth within Beccles are likely to displace out of catchment admissions in the longer term. This highlights the need for Waveney District and Suffolk County councils to liaise closely with the affected schools as the spatial strategy is developed.

Halesworth
An additional 476 to 762 dwellings is expected to generate demand for the following minimum pupil yields.
Early Years (2-5): 48-76
Primary (5-11): 119-191
Secondary (11-16): 86-137
Sixth Form (16+): 19-30

Early Years
There is currently limited capacity with existing providers of early education facilities as well as limited scope to expand existing amenities. In terms of influencing the market, and considering the surrounding villages, there is a fine line between having sufficient children to operate a sustainable provision and having sufficient spaces available at the right time to meet growing demand. However, it is reasonable to assume that at least one new setting would be required. These may be alongside a new primary school, within new developments (if large enough) or within the town, including the town centre. Planning policies, including retail, should enable such provision.

Primary
Depending on the level of growth and capacity at the Edgar Sewter Primary, a new primary school may be required on one of the sites that are selected. In selecting the sites, care will need to be taken to consider the degree to which the new school can be delivered and that the new school is located in optimum position to maximise trips by sustainable modes.

Secondary
Halesworth is included within the Bungay High School catchment, however, there is an interaction with demand for places elsewhere. There might be capacity at Bungay High School or ability for the school to be extended. However, the overall growth within its catchment area needs to be considered.

Southwold & Reydon
An additional 286 to 572 dwellings is expected to generate demand for the following minimum pupil yields.
Early Years (2-5): 29-57
Primary (5-11): 72-143
Secondary (11-16): 51-103
Sixth Form (16+): 11-23

Early Years
There are three providers in the area and some existing capacity could be used depending on the scale of development.

Primary
The catchment primary schools are Reydon and Southwold. Depending on the level of growth and location and the capacity of schools, there may be sufficient spaces to accommodate additional housing.
Secondary

The catchment secondary school is Sir John Leman High. However, pupils also attend Beccles Free School. Depending on the level of growth within the wider catchment, and location and the capacity of schools, there may be sufficient spaces to accommodate additional housing.

Bungay

An additional 191 to 381 dwellings is expected to generate demand for the following minimum pupil yields.

- Early Years (2-5): 19-38
- Primary (5-11): 48-95
- Secondary (11-16): 34-69
- Sixth Form (16+): 8-15

Early Years

There is currently capacity at Emmanuel Pre-school (around 29 places). However, significant development would require contributions for additional capacity which is likely to be drawn from the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Primary

The catchment primary school is Bungay Primary. Depending on the level of growth and location and the capacity of schools, there may be sufficient spaces to accommodate additional housing.

Secondary

Bungay High School serves a large area including Halesworth, Broome, Ditchingham, Ellingham other parts of South Norfolk. The current forecasts indicate a declining pupil roll. South Norfolk District Council’s site allocations document was adopted in October 2015 and approximately 50 dwellings are planned in this area. Depending on the level of growth and location, such as in Halesworth, there may be sufficient spaces to accommodate additional housing and the school itself has got potential to expand.

Similar to Beccles, Bungay provides education places to pupils from Lowestoft. This trend needs to be monitored carefully and factored into future versions of the local plan. Based on the current forecasts and the pattern of development within the catchment set out in the local plan, there may need to be an additional 245 places provided at the school.

Rural Areas

An additional 476 to 1,143 dwellings is expected to generate demand for the following minimum pupil yields.

- Early Years (2-5): 48-114
- Primary (5-11): 119-286
- Secondary (11-16): 86-206
Sixth Form (16+): 19-46
The provision of free home to school transport is a factor that forms part of the County council’s consideration of development in rural areas. Children aged between 5 and 16 years old are entitled to free home to school transport if they are either:
- under 8 years old and live 2 miles or more and are attending their nearest or Transport Priority Area school, or
- 8 years old or over and live 3 miles or more from their nearest school and are attending their nearest or Transport Priority Area school

Early Years
In terms of influencing the market within rural areas, there is a fine line between having sufficient children to operate a sustainable provision from a wide area and having sufficient spaces available at the right time to meet growing demand. Whilst community facilities often provide vital activities, these are not provided on a contractual basis necessary for the securing the entitlement. For example, in Wangford, Uggeshall and Henham, there is no existing Early Years provision.

Primary
Some additional housing growth can support rural primary schools and can help halt declining pupil rolls and is an example of how new developments in rural areas can meet the needs of local communities. Suffolk County council would welcome further discussion with Waveney District Council on how both authorities and parish councils can further explore the options.

Secondary
The main issue that arises is the provision of free school transport.

New Settlement
An additional 1,905 dwellings is expected to generate demand for the following minimum pupil yields.

- Early Years (2-5): 191
- Primary (5-11): 476
- Secondary (11-16): 343
- Sixth Form (16+): 76

The indicative size of the new settlement might be sufficient to justify a new early years settlements and a new large primary school but are not likely to be sufficient to provide a new secondary school. This means that secondary-aged children would need to attend an existing school. This means that sustainable travel, including public transport and school bus routes, becomes a significant influence in considering a location.

Attached:
Appendix 2 Secondary school capacity and forecast
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 2180

Comment Library Provision
Libraries help create the sustainable, healthy communities referred to in chapter 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The county council approximates the additional demand for library service provision based on a national benchmark of 30 square metres of library floorspace per thousand people, and an assumption of 2.4 people in each of the dwellings proposed for allocation in this plan. Working with Waveney District Council and its parishes, the County council and Suffolk Libraries will identify what provision will need to be delivered to serve this population growth and develop bespoke projects, library by library. A programme for expanding library service provision in Waveney will be developed alongside the Local Plan and aligned to any reconsideration of the Community Infrastructure Levy. In some cases, such as the potential growth to the south of Lowestoft, provision may be sought on-site.
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 2182

Comment Blundeston
The large sites around Blundeston (63, 42, 129) are not currently desirable as there are limited amenities and services within reasonable distance to promote sustainable travel patterns and some of the road network might not be of sufficient standard or capacity. If this scale of development, including growth beyond the village and the proposed redevelopment of the prison, is to be brought forward, a comprehensive review of transport issues will need to be undertaken which may include opportunities for further enhancement of transport infrastructure and services.

Southwold and Reydon
Growth in Southwold and Reydon should be limited to meeting immediate local needs as there are no rail connections and the vehicle access is limited to one road into and out of the area, which is subject to flooding. The resilience of local infrastructure and services will need to be considered further and the county council will assist with reviewing this issue. In terms of detail, site 6 does not appear to be connected to the highway.

Bungay
Subject to further assessments through the planning process, the proposed level of development is acceptable in principle. However, access constraints are likely to be identified on site 39; any proposed access onto Annis Hill would require widening the road due to its narrow width, this site should provide its main access from B1062.

Beccles
The county council welcomes the reference to the Beccles South Relief Road and encourages the district authority to mark the route on the Beccles site map. Subject to any further assessments, the proposed level of growth around Beccles is generally acceptable with the exception of the following sites 124, 50, 71, and 77 since these are all further out from the town centre and less likely to encourage sustainable travel choices.

Halesworth and Holton
Proposed development at both locations is, in principal, acceptable (subject to further assessments thought the planning process).

Surface Water Management
The County council is the Lead Local Flood Authority for flood risk arising
from sources other than rivers and the sea, for which the Environment Agency has lead responsibility.

The County council has produced guidance on managing surface water issues through the development process, which explains the county council's role. It is available through the following link:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan Harrison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**   | Redisham  
Sewage treatment works. Extra school places. Access the health services, road development, public transport, local shop. |
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID 1525

Comment There is a need for increased educational provision to supplement the loss of our Middle School and to attract young families to Halesworth. The WDC Green Infrastructure Strategy July 2015 identified that "Halesworth has the poorest access to sports facilities in this part of the District" The approval, construction and financial support should be a priority if National Government guidelines on Health and Wellbeing are to be supported.

The threat of closure of our hospital will impact on health care unless a new facility is built with community beds allocated as currently exist in Patrick Stead Hospital.

Our road infrastructure should be reviewed and Phase 2 of the relief road should be revisited before any new developments are designated.

The promotion and encouragement to bring employment to Halesworth is a vital link in preventing Halesworth from becoming a 'retirement town'. There seems to be no cohesive strategy to bring new businesses to the Town.

The sewage system is operating at near maximum capacity at times and should be expanded to contend with any new housing. A review of the current flooding problems have identified the need for remedial action upstream of the bridge in the Thoroughfare Halesworth and if we are to prevent another flood in the Town urgent action should be taken.
Q22 What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

Comment ID: 2173

Comment:

With regard to the various potential development sites in Waveney, I'm afraid I cannot comment on them individually because of the numerous on-site complexities, but I have attached a pdf copy of UK Power Networks' latest Regional development Plan, which comments on a high level basis about our wider infrastructure. The constraints documented previously would apply to residential development as well as industrial. UK Power Networks infrastructure can support some further growth, but constraints obviously exist in terms of the total increase in power demand that we can accommodate. In the short to medium term, as long as a massive development is not sanctioned by your authority, then I believe UK Power Networks should be able to work with stakeholders to resolve reasonably developments and their respective power demands. Looking at our network it would appear that a significant obstacle would be getting power cables from Beccles Town centre across the Network Rail infrastructure; if we can achieve this then it could unlock the door for the 1,000 new residential properties in Worlingham as well as further employment expansion.

Please note that the comments above are valid at the present time; the electricity network, and the load connected to it, changes over time.

If you need any information on a specific development area then please let me know and I will endeavour to assist where I can.

Regional Development Plan
Bramford – Suffolk Coast (EPN)

Executive Summary
This Regional Development Plan (RDP) reviews UK Power Networks (UKPN) EPN HV and EHV network supplied from Bramford and Norwich Grid Supply Points (GSP).

The area is fed via three Grid substations at Wickham Market, Halesworth and Ilketshall, and due to the interconnected nature of the 33kV network, there is also an overlap with Stowmarket and Diss Grids (RDP10) at the 33kV level.

This coastal area of Suffolk and south Norfolk is characterized as mostly rural and includes the main towns of Halesworth, Bungay and Beccles along with several smaller market towns, covering an area of circa 1000 km² and...
The key infrastructure in the region is the nuclear power station at Sizewell, where new reactors are proposed which feed directly into the National Grid (NG) network at Bramford. A substantial number of generation connection enquiries have also been received in this area.

Summary of issues addressed

The area covered in this document is the Suffolk coast from Ipswich in the south, northwards almost to Lowestoft, and inland to Halesworth and Bungay. It includes Sizewell which may require a ‘temporary builder’s supply’ for construction of the new reactor and for other nearby accommodation and material stores. The three 132/33kV Grid sites at Wickham Market, Halesworth and Ilketshall are fed from the dual circuit tower line between Bramford and Norwich. The present and predicted loads are within the capability of the 175mm² conductor from the Norwich direction and would allow the temporary transfer of the three sites onto either source if necessary. The circuits from Bramford to the Wickham Market tee are 300mm² conductor. No Primary sites are presently predicted to require reinforcement during the period to 2023, although three sites could require works within this period if employment demand increases faster than anticipated. Additional housing will be relatively small numbers spread across several towns and is not expected to require specific upstream reinforcement.

Leiston is close to Sizewell and would be the likely source for any additional construction supplies (dependent upon the volume of power required). Some spare capacity is available but above that transformers and switchgear would need replacing. There is adequate capacity on the Leiston-Benhall ring out of Wickham Market for reasonable load growth. Halesworth is on an industrial area which could be expanded. In this case a transformer change would allow a first stage of expansion prior to any switchgear replacement.

Beccles has an industrial area on the former Ellough aerodrome which is some distance from Beccles Primary. Ellough is designated in the Waveney Council Plan as a site for further expansion and enquiries have been received for this area in the past, although none have progressed. Whilst the Primary has some headroom, the 11kV network has limited capacity and either new circuits or the establishment of Ellough Primary would be required. At Beccles, a transformer change would provide capacity for further load, after which the incoming 33kV cables would be the local limit. Network studies indicate that an additional 10MVA could be accommodated before the first n-1 circuit limit on the wider network is reached.
Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

AP and AE Wolton

Section
Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

Comment ID
1621

Comment
New bridge over Lake Lothing.
* When does work commence?
* What is estimated date of completion?
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

**Section**

Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

**Comment ID**

2006

**Comment**

Whilst this may provide a solution to the gridlock caused by the operation of the haven bridge, I fail to see how it opens up regeneration opportunities unless it can also serve as a new access for the Brooke Peninsula. If it can, then it may assist in bringing forward the housing development provided that any cost contribution for the development is minimal.
### Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment  | None  
There is very little industry here now - not enough to sustain the local population |

---

www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/newwaveneylocalplan  1053
Chris Morris

Section Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

Comment ID 1609

Comment Priority to third crossing. Must improve north-south traffic flow. Even a bridge over railway at O.B. north would improve things.
CTC John Thompson

Section Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

Comment ID 179

Comment None ultimately. It will just create more traffic discouraging people coming here.
A truly tragic and expensive mistake!!!
John Bumpus

Section | Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

Comment ID | 592

Comment | The Plan should have contingent provisions in case the Third Crossing fails to materialise. These would focus development to the North and only allow development to the South once the crossing is guaranteed. If it does happen further development would be possible to the south of Lake Lothing and on the A12 south of Lowestoft.
John Eade

Section Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

Comment ID 522

Comment The area around the crossing will become more attractive to business users. A significant element of the problems with Lowestoft is the difficulty caused by delays on the entry/exit routes. This opportunity should be used to regenerate the centre of Lowestoft.
Haycock

Section Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

Comment ID 899

Comment No view. I suggest looking to other places (Manchester, Liverpool, Rotterdam) for inspiration.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

Comment ID 666

Comment The opportunity to sort out the nightmare travel scenarios currently experienced (with level crossings and bridge closures). Could we not also co-ordinate bridge closures better? In Weymouth harbour, for instance, there are regular times when the bridge is raised (just as there is a train timetable). People can then plan around that, rather than get caught short. As for other regeneration opportunities, I think that the North Quay retail site and Oulton Broad could both benefit from better and more diverse retail options. I also look forward to some better civic options, like the improved library and ways that we might access WDC information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norman Castleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peter Eyres

Section Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

Comment ID 1417

Comment Close the existing harbour bridge to cars when the third crossing is built. Lorries have to be allowed to use it so that they can gain access to the Beach industrial area and the shops with minimum disruption to the town. This will encourage people to walk or to use buses and bicycles to travel into town.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terry McDonald

Section Q23 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from a new crossing over Lake Lothing?

Comment ID 105

Comment Improve traffic flow of the A12 from Kessingland to Great Yarmouth, bypassing London Road South and Yarmouth Road entirely. Waveney Drive becomes more of a destination being directly linked to the main flow along the new A12 route over the new Third Crossing and thus would benefit from serious redevelopment of the existing unused brownfield site into leisure based retail outlets. With traffic moved away from London Road South the Kirkly Shops area and South Beach is open for serious redevelopment and possible near total pedestrianisation.
Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Andrew Nainby

Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 964

Comment Development should be concentrated on the space between the existing town and the relief road, to keep additional traffic etc off existing roads
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

**Section**
Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

**Comment ID**
2007

**Comment**
The Beccles southern relief road provides an opportunity to service additional housing land to the south of the town as well as providing a link for lorries. The reduction in traffic in the town centre should be welcomed.
**Section**  Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

**Comment ID**  1023

**Comment**  The Beccles Southern Relief Road will create a new development boundary for the town. It is vital that any infill development allows cycling and walking into the existing streets of Beccles but only allows motorised access outwards onto the relief road. The Beccles Southern Relief Road must be accompanied by measures to ensure ALL through traffic is eliminate from Beccles. Speed limits on the town side of the Beccles Southern Relief Road should be reduced to 30mph (max) for strategic routes and 20mph elsewhere. Strict weight limits must be applied on the town side of the Beccles Southern Relief. The A145 must be diverted out of the town along the Beccles Southern Relief Road and Copland Way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The Southern relief road will constitute a new development boundary for the town. Infill developments must be restricted to within that area and must allow walking/cycling into the existing Beccles streets. Motorised access must be outwards only towards the relief road. It is an opportunity to ensure all through traffic is eliminated from Beccles. Speed restrictions and weight limits should be in place on the town side. The A145 must be diverted out of town along the relief road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 2119

Comment Evolution Town Planning made representations on behalf of the landowners BKW Ltd at the call for sites stage for land at Ellough Airfield. We submitted details of 9ha of available land at Ellough for employment uses.

Road transport access to the site from the A145 (A12) to the south is currently via Beccles to the A146 and south down Copland Way. In transport and access terms this is a constraint on the development potential of the Ellough Airfield. This will be improved when the Beccles relief road is opened.

The proposed Beccles Southern Relief Road is described by Suffolk County Council: "Beccles Southern Relief Road will be a 2-lane single carriageway road. The new route will provide a direct link between the A145 London Road at Weston in the west and the Beccles Business Park and Ellough Industrial Estates at Ellough Moor in the east. The route will also provide a through connection to the B1127 Copland Way and, further east, to the existing A146 Lowestoft Road between Worlingham and North Cove."

A New Anglia LEP media release from July 2014 stated (our emphasis in bold): "The road will connect the A145 to Ellough, providing faster access to Beccles Business Park and the Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft (New Anglia) Enterprise Zone.

This will enable 20 new companies to locate to the site with the creation of over 1200 jobs and an expected boost worth millions of pounds to the local economy. It also means less congestion for Beccles as traffic will no longer need to travel through the centre of town.

Mark Pendlington, Chairman of New Anglia LEP said: "Better transport links are the key to unlocking growth and this project is a clear example of that. This road will provide greater access for businesses at the Ellough Airfield site, increasing the viability of the Enterprise Zone and in turn attract hundreds of new jobs and apprenticeships. It is a great vote of confidence from Government that this project has been awarded the funds that it rightly deserves and it is thanks to collaborative working between New Anglia, its local authority partners, MPs and business leaders."
Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 1099

Comment None

There is very little industry here now - not enough to sustain the local population.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 1810

Comment Employment
CTC John Thompson

Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 180

Comment I can see some sense in this road in that it will keep heavy lorries out of Beccles, but can't envisage it will encourage development in Beccles. That said, quieter roads might encourage more sustainable transport use, particularly perhaps helping bus services
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 365

Comment Any large scale development in Beccles should be located adjacent to this new road for reasons of access and that there are areas of no special habitat or landscape interest for development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief</td>
<td>The relief road looks like it will increase opportunities for both commercial and residential development whilst enhancing the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road for development in and around Beccles?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section  Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID  523

Comment  The Beccles Southern Relief Road will remove some of the problems of traffic in Beccles at peak times. It should help those industries currently in Ellough and could allow some further development there.
John Trew

Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 21

Comment The new by-pass will obviously make access much easier but the construction of the new road shouldn't be the reason to encourage large scale development of both industry and housing in the immediate area. It is, after all, by definition a relief road to ease existing traffic not an excuse for development.
Larkfleet Homes
Seth Williams

Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 2156

Comment The forthcoming construction of the Beccles Southern Relief Road presents an opportunity to enhance the southern side of the town and the Ellough Enterprise Zone in particular by improving the access to and from the area, by reducing traffic congestion through the town and by removing the need for heavy goods vehicles to travel through the constrained roads through the town centre.

It also promotes the prospect of improving accessibility between the town and the Ellough Industrial Estate and Enterprise Zone by enabling improved cycle/pedestrian connections along Ellough Road. Larkfleet's proposed development would further complement and supplement these connections and promote accessibility both from the proposed development itself and the wider town beyond.

Furthermore, the Relief Road itself would provide a physical and visual element of containment to the south of the town such that any development in this area would be clearly confined from the wider landscape and countryside beyond.
Iesley beevor

Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 782

Comment leisure centre - would be accessible from many geographical areas and would negate need to travel into Lowestoft and/or cross bridge,
Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 1050

Comment This relief road is urgent. I fully support it
Haycock

Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 900

Comment Removal of HGV traffic will improve well-being and tourism in Beccles and the surrounds. However, any large scale, isolated affordable housing development around Ellough would be unwise in my view unless, perhaps, it was in the context of a new, self-contained settlement. Industrial smells impact upon the likely suitability for residential, food retail or leisure complexes in that area, too.
Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 994

Comment The relief road will stop hgv's and through traffic having to go through town to get to the ring road thus making the town safer and more cycle/walker friendly.
Any developments to the south of Beccles or towards Ellough would have access straight onto it.
Offers a quicker journey by car to lowestoft from outlying towns and could include cycle route too.
Nicky Elliott

Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 971

Comment The Beccles Southern Relief Road provides a limit to development to the south of the town. Any infill development must ensure that motorised access is only from the Southern Relief Road and NOT from the existing residential roads, which should allow only cycle and pedestrian access. The purpose of the Beccles Southern Relief Road is to alleviate through traffic from the town, but it cannot do this without additional traffic calming / controlling measures such as a blanket 20mph speed limit on all residential roads and a 30mph limit on more strategic routes through the town. Weight limits must be introduced on the through routes, and the A145 must be diverted along the Southern Relief Road and Copland Way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul Douch</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

Comment ID 56

Comment One concern has always been that its construction would inevitably lead to the area between it and the existing town boundaries being filled in with housing etc. If this were to be under consideration it should be on the basis that the road would be the long term limit for future development, and that it should include some complimentary retail and leisure areas along with significant green spaces and sporting options.
A park and ride option linking the town centre would help, along with the continued expansion of the Ellough industrial estate for both industrial and commercial developments. This is important so that local jobs are generated that can be filled by local people, thus reducing their dependence on the commute to Norwich, Yarmouth or Lowestoft.
john norris

**Section** Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?

**Comment ID** 833

**Comment** the southern relief road will enable development on the southern and eastern sides to take place without bringing to mush traffic through the town
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q24 What are the opportunities arising from the Beccles Southern Relief Road for development in and around Beccles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q25 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from increased flood protection?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section  Q25 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from increased flood protection?

Comment ID  2008

Comment  Flood protection for the town opens up the possibilities of development on both Commercial and Peto Roads and this will be of benefit to the town. In addition it will reduce the cost of regeneration of the Brooke Peninsula and make the construction on the site easier and less expensive.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q25 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from increased flood protection?

Comment ID 1100

Comment None
Flooding will increase again if there is more housing.
Carlton Colville is part of the Kirkley Stream. What increased flood protection has there been in Carlton Colville?
CTC John Thompson

Section Q25 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from increased flood protection?

Comment ID 181

Comment This is not my area of expertise so can't make specific comments. I can only comment in a general way that it makes sense if there is less flood risk employers are more likely to locate in Lowestoft and business are more likely to set up
Environment Agency

Section Q25 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from increased flood protection?

Comment ID 2101

Comment We welcome the development of a new and up to date Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the Waveney area, this will help you identify in detail the flood zones and define the functional flood plain area. Your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) are fundamental in providing you with the evidence base to make site level or community based assessments of issues relating to future flood risk management. The SFRA helps to demonstrate the potential change in flood risk over the next 100 years.
John Eade

Section Q25 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from increased flood protection?

Comment ID 524

Comment The security offered from flooding should help businesses in Lowestoft be more confident for the future and could be used to improve the centre of the town for visitors. There are opportunities to integrate some of the history of the town into the flood protection and make the past of Lowestoft an integral element of its present rather than only give the appearance of decaying town.
Haycock

**Section**

Q25 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from increased flood protection?

**Comment ID**

901

**Comment**

Again, why not initiate competitions (maybe internationally open) for imaginative schemes?
Norman Castleton

Section Q25 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from increased flood protection?

Comment ID 426

Comment Too little too late. The town will take a long time to recover from the last flooding and it could happen again before these improvements are made. The beach is now in a poor state. Flood defences have been neglected for far too long. If it were not for private investments in the Corton and Hopton area more of our lovely coastline would be lost. However, improved flood defences will help to improve the station square area which remains dreadful and needs a thorough refurbishment.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q25 What are the new development and regeneration opportunities in and around Lowestoft arising from increased flood protection?

Comment ID 1930

Comment No comment.
Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Anonymous

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 142

Comment Yes. Focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals.
Anonymous

Section

Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID

245

Comment

Yes - focus on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals
**Anonymous**

**Section**  
Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

**Comment ID**  
296

**Comment**  
Yes - widened to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley.
Anonymous

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 311

Comment Yes - the remaining Area Action Plan proposals.
Anonymous

Section

Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 330

Comment No.
Anonymous

Section  Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID  1582

Comment  Ticked 'yes'; ticked 'widened to cover areas of the town centre, South Beach and Kirkley'.
Anonymous

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 1628

Comment Yes. Widened to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AP and AE Wolton

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 1620

Comment Yes. Widen to cover areas of the town centre, South Beach and Kirkley.
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 2009

Comment This should focus on the wider area
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 1101

Comment a) Yes
b) It should be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley so that it all fits together?
Chris Morris
Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 1608

Comment Yes. A regeneration strategy should be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 1811

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CTC John Thompson</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David Burman

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 636

Comment Yes, widened to cover areas of the town centre, south beach and Kirkley.
Debbie Read

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 344

Comment No.
Environment Agency

Section
Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 2102

Comment
We strongly supported the policies in the Area Action Plan (AAP) from 2010 and we would like to see this level of detail retained in future plans. We welcome further consultation on the specific details if this is likely to be changed for the Local Plan.
Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 1597

Comment Yes. The remaining AAP proposals.
Ian King

Section  Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID  563

Comment  No.
James Toole

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 191

Comment Yes. Focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals.
Lowestoft & Waveney Chamber of Commerce Linda Thornton

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 2235

Comment LWCoC supports the inclusion in the Local Plan of a detailed regeneration strategy for Lowestoft which should deliver the remaining Area Action Plan proposals but widened to cover all of the Town Centre, South Beach and South Quay.
Lynette Meen

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 1636

Comment Yes. Widened to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley.
Haycock

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 902

Comment 26(a) Yes.
26(b) It should be wider.
Anne McClarnon

Section
Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID
667

Comment
a) Yes
b) Wider areas, including the High Street and other parts of Kirkley.
Norman Castleton

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 427

Comment The Local Plan should contain a detailed regeneration plan for Central Lowestoft and (b) it should cover the suggested wider area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment ID | 1673 |
| Comment | Yes - The strategy should focus on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals. |
Pamela Morris

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 562

Comment Yes, focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peter Cockerton and Karen Evans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 834

Comment yes
Rebecca Brough

Section  Q26  a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID  641

Comment  Local Plan should continue to contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Lowestoft focused on remaining Area Action Plan proposals.
**Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?**

**Comment ID** 1367

**Comment** Yes – but widened.
S Rossi

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 1569

Comment Yes. Widened to cover area of the town centre, South Beach and Kirkley
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>S T Blower</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong> 1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> Ticked 'Yes' and 'The remaining Area Action Plan proposals'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 615

Comment It needs to be wider as suggested
Sarah Cross

Section  Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID  133

Comment  Yes. Focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals.
**Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q26  a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | a) Yes  
b) Yes                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 1931

Comment No comment.
St James South Elmham Parish Meeting Mary Henry

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 811

Comment Our responses are: yes, the Local Plan should continue a detailed regeneration strategy for central Lowestoft, and yes, it should be widened to cover the Town Centre etc.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 1475

Comment Any regeneration of central Lowestoft should ensure that the existing County Wildlife Sites are adequately protected and managed.
Susan Harrison

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 2189

Comment Yes, focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals.
Terry McDonald

Section Q26 a) Should the Local Plan contain a detailed regeneration strategy for Central Lowestoft? b) Should such a strategy be focused on the remaining Area Action Plan proposals or should it be wider to cover areas of the Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley?

Comment ID 106

Comment The Town Centre, South Beach and Kirkley are in desperate need of development and should not be ignored. The Area Action Plan should be broadened to cover these areas.
Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?

Comment ID 2010

Comment Yes
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?

Comment ID 1538

Comment Is there any potential for the proposals off shore to affect the Broads? That is to say, the cables and stations associated with transporting power generated off shore, is there a need for these to go through the Broads for example? It is recommended that any future policies that relate to such infrastructure in Waveney should be worked up with the Broads in mind.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?

Comment ID 1102

Comment Yes but it should be borne in mind that it might not be a long term asset.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section | Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?

Comment ID | 1812

Comment | Yes but not exclusively as this will not be as relevant when installed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTC John Thompson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environment Agency

Section Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?

Comment ID 2103

Comment The Local Plan also aims to promote offshore renewable energy as a targeted growth sector, we support this. However, offshore wind farms often pose large risks for the environment and will need to be considered carefully. There is often mitigation work required on the land fall infrastructure due to the nature of works required to be undertaken. We would therefore encourage early consultation with us on any planned offshore wind farms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haycock</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes, but also look for opportunities to develop a more general engineering community, e.g. precision engineering, control electronics, motor design, computer-aided design, maritime engineering, tribology, drone surveillance services, specialised welding, 3-d printing, heat transfer modelling, infra-red thermographic services, and so on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?

Comment ID 668

Comment Yes: this is the most sensible and realistic plan.
Section Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?

Comment ID 428

Comment Only if feasible. Otherwise use resources elsewhere.
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

Section Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?

Comment ID 1190

Comment There is little else left
john norris

Section

Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?

Comment ID 835

Comment yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes - but Great Yarmouth and Waveney need to work together on this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q27 Should we continue to promote the development of a renewable energy and offshore engineering cluster at the PowerPark?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q28 Should we continue to promote retail and leisure development at Peto Square or should we promote a wider range of uses or a more leisure focused option?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q28 Should we continue to promote retail and leisure development at Peto Square or should we promote a wider range of uses or a more leisure focused option?

Comment ID 2011

Comment A wider focus is needed – there are not enough players in the market to support a narrow focus.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q28 Should we continue to promote retail and leisure development at Peto Square or should we promote a wider range of uses or a more leisure focused option?

Comment ID 1103

Comment Yes to both suggestions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTC John Thompson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haycock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section Q28 Should we continue to promote retail and leisure development at Peto Square or should we promote a wider range of uses or a more leisure focused option?

Comment ID 669

Comment I think a varied mix of leisure and retail makes sense for Peto Square. It is one of the entry points to Lowestoft (from the train station) and so is a "shop front" for the town and should be inviting and welcoming for visitors. It should also be easy for residents to access (currently not great when you consider the road situation round there).
Norman Castleton

Section Q28 Should we continue to promote retail and leisure development at Peto Square or should we promote a wider range of uses or a more leisure focused option?

Comment ID 429

Comment Continue as now.
Peter Eyres

Q28 Should we continue to promote retail and leisure development at Peto Square or should we promote a wider range of uses or a more leisure focused option?

Comment ID 1418

Comment There seems little point in expanding retail into “Peto Square” when 5 retail units in London Road North are closing, three of them very close to Station Square,. What would be good would be to bring the station building into use. It is a pity the bus and railway stations are separated; it would be a big improvement if the bus station could be brought next to the railway station. As it is, the bus station is a poor advertisement for a town as large and important as Lowestoft.
**Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q28 Should we continue to promote retail and leisure development at Peto Square or should we promote a wider range of uses or a more leisure focused option?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terry McDonald

Section
Q28 Should we continue to promote retail and leisure development at Peto Square or should we promote a wider range of uses or a more leisure focused option?

Comment ID
107

Comment
Given it’s location, a wider range of uses makes more sense. Peto Square is in the wrong place (not that it can be moved). The South Beach and Kirkly Shops area should be more focused on this type of Leisure outlet.
Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for this site?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for this site?

Comment ID
2012

Comment
This site is an eyesore – you should have a completely open mind about its future use.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

| Section | Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for th
|
| Comment ID | 1104 |
| Comment | Yes |
**Councillor Norman Brooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Put emphasis on high value high quality housing to bring in money to the area. See developments in Norwich, Ipswich, Bristol, London, Manchester etc etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environment Agency

Section

Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for this site?

Comment ID 2104

Comment

We have identified that there is a risk of flooding on this site. A sequential approach should be followed when the site is developed, with the most vulnerable uses being located in the least vulnerable parts of the site.

It is hard to comment on this site specifically at this stage as an up to date SFRA has not yet been produced with all of the most up to date modelling including new climate change allowances (which our models currently do not include).

You will need to revisit the Sequential and Exception Tests which were prepared for the AAP to consider changes to the flood risk. Site availability and circumstances is also likely to have changed in the past 6/7 years.

When your SFRA is completed and specific site allocations are put forward we would welcome further consultation about the site selection process to understand the employment and residential scenarios and design layout of the area.
Haycock

Section Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for this

Comment ID 905

Comment Again, look to other reinvented urban waterside locations for ideas. Perhaps there are unmet tourism needs that could be addressed to add to the 'Broads experience'.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for thi

Comment ID 670

Comment Yes: get on with it! This site has been derelict for so long and we don’t want it to be like the Zephyr Cams site, which has been empty for years and years. A disgrace!
Norman Castleton

Section Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for thi

Comment ID 430

Comment Delete the housing option and concentrate on business and employment opportunities.
Paul Douch

Section Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for this

Comment ID 855

Comment Mixed-use, yes.
1380 homes seems excessive – give them space, though not for car parking (limit that to 1 per household?); and community facilities, eg nursery and/or school, community/youth centre, landscaped park/ play area. Make a large proportion of the homes starter and for retired people.
Yes to small/medium-scale employment facilities
Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for this site?

Comment ID: 617

Comment: It's been vacant for so long now - it is time to look at wider uses eg leisure?
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for thi

Comment ID 1934

Comment No comment.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for thi

Comment ID 1476

Comment Any regeneration of central Lowestoft should ensure that the existing County Wildlife Sites are adequately protected and managed.
Terry McDonald

Section Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for this

Comment ID 108

Comment Yes, and it should be a very high priority.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section Q29 The former Jeld Wen Factory site, which forms part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and Kirkley Waterfront site is currently proposed for waterfront employment and housing adjacent to Waveney Drive. Is this still the most appropriate use for thi

Comment ID 1444

Comment Judging from lack of progress in developing around Lake Lothing generally delivery of large scale housing schemes appears a tad unrealistic
Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 2013

Comment Leave this to the market. Being prescriptive will hold up delivery.
brian may

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 264

Comment
AS MUCH AS I WOULD LIKE A MIXTURE OF HOUSING IT SEEMS THAT UNLESS THE COUNCIL IS GOING TO BE ALLOWED TO BUILD FOR ITSELF, INVESTORS WILL HAVE TO BE ALLOWED TO DECIDE WHAT TYPES OF HOUSING ARE LIKELY TO BE PROFITABLE OTHERWISE NOTHING WILL GET BUILT.
ALSO ATTEMPTS IN THE PAST TO GET DEVELOPERS TO BUILD SOCIAL HOUSES AND INFRASTRUCTURE HAVE SIMPLY BEEN BY PASSED BY A NUMBER OF MEANS.
I WOULD SUGGEST THAT HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS, LOCAL SELF BUILD GROUPS ETC BE GIVEN PRIORIITY IF IT COMES TO A CHOICE OF WHO DEVELOPES A SITE.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1105

Comment We should continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need
Charles Fortt

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1219

Comment The market has not delivered what is needed and is unlikely to meet the needs of lower income households in the future. We are told there is no profit in so-called "affordable housing", which is why developers prefer building large expensive houses with only a third of the development being "affordable". So housing should be based on the local authority's assessment of need.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1815

Comment Housing market for sustainable finance.
CTC John Thompson

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 185

Comment Strikes me it should be based on local need, which surely in effect is the local market.
Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming

Section
Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 2087

Comment
The starting point should be undertaken through an assessment of local need contained in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. However, this evidence will only take into consideration the housing need at a single point in time and is therefore subject to changes in the demographic profile of the area over time. Therefore, any policy relating to the mix and type of housing will need to allow for a sufficient degree of flexibility so that it is able to react to changing circumstances across the district. This should not limit the ability of a developer to put forward a scheme which contains an alternative mix such as instances where existing need is not being met, issues relating to development viability or in circumstances where updated evidence identifies the need to divert from existing policy.
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 366

Comment Keep a policy requiring a mix of housing - left to themselves developers will always build for maximum profit, hence the proliferation of 'executive' type houses we are seeing.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1718

Comment Housing should be market led, but include a proportion of affordable housing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jim Elmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John and Barbara Carter

Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1515

Comment

It is essential that construction of second homes is severally restricted as the existing high proportion of such homes in Southwold and Reydon is already having a significant adverse impact on both communities. Suitable dwellings for the ever increasing older population should be provided and the fact that many older people live alone should be taken into account.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>John Eade</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1833

Comment It is acknowledged that if development is of a different mix of housing e.g. 2-3 bed dwellings in a predominantly 4-5 bed dwelling area, then densities may differ. However it is vital that the design of such developments does not have a negative impact on the area and its surroundings.
Larkfleet Homes
Seth Williams

Section
Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID
2157

Comment
* The Council should avoid any prescriptive policy on housing mix. It should set a percentage target for affordable housing but recognise viability concerns, particularly given the lack of flexibility with CIL.
The requirement to deliver a mix of housing based on need is consistent with national policy. Paragraph 50 of the Framework requires that Local Authorities:
"...plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community.... and identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand".
The Framework therefore recognises that although Local Authorities should understand the need for particular types and sizes of home, and take steps to plan to meet this need, market trends and the type of product being demanded locally are also important considerations.
Equally, different sites are more suitable for different types of property. For instance, town centre location, near to facilities, may be more suitable for flatted developments with 1 or 2 bedroom units, whilst certain village locations may be more suitable for a mix with larger properties, reflecting the particular character of the location.
Therefore, the Council should avoid any policy which is over prescriptive in terms of the mix of dwellings required across all sites, allowing the market respond to market demand and for schemes to be developed which are sensitive to their particular context.
Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1069

Comment

The existing Local Plan policy sets the requirement for housing type and mix, which is based upon local need from the Housing Market Assessment and applies to developments throughout the District. It is considered that there are different housing requirements across the District. On small scale-sites of up to 25 units it is appropriate for the market to dictate and for housing to be market-led with developers commissioning and undertaking market research to identify the most appropriate mix and type of housing to be included in any development proposal. On smaller sites it can be restrictive to enforce policy on mix and type of housing that relies on a district-wide assessment of local need.

Market research has been undertaken to identify the market demand in Lowestoft near to our client's site and any residential development on the site will be developed to reflect these identified housing market requirements.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1242

Comment The existing Local Plan policy sets the requirement for housing type and mix, which is based upon local need from the Housing Market Assessment and applies to developments throughout the District. It is considered that there are different housing requirements in different locations across the District. On small-scale sites it is appropriate for the market to dictate and for housing to be market-led with developers commissioning and undertaking market research to identify the most appropriate mix and type of housing to be included in any development proposal. It can sometimes be restrictive to enforce policy on mix and type of housing that relies on a district-wide assessment of local need, particularly on smaller sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haycock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Andrew Macalpine

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 51

Comment As the owner of a second home in Southwold I believe Waveney should pursue a far more aggressive approach to Housing on the lines of the recent decision at St Ives to restrict the purchase of all new housing to local people.
Andrew Macalpine
Anne McClarnon

Section

Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 671

Comment

It should be based on local needs. I don't trust developers (the market) to deliver the housing that's actually needed (or wanted!). If we are to plan for over-65s, please don’t offer them pokey accommodation. They may have the funds to buy something a bit more pleasant and wouldn't want to be housed like chickens in a geriatric ghetto. That said, if there was high-quality housing that was affordable for over-65s then they might agree to sell their current homes, which would free those up for other residents. Low-rise flats with garden spaces and access to a range of facilities (transport, medical, shopping) might work very well (as per elsewhere in the country).
Nicky Elliott

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 727

Comment Retain the policy.
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1674

Comment We consider the housing should be based on local need. Oulton needs housing for retired people wishing to downsize from large houses to small bungalows. If this type of housing was available for the retired people, this would release larger homes for families.
**Pamela Cyprien**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pamela Cyprien

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1264

Comment Yes
Paul Douch

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 856

Comment Mix and type according to local need assessment
Jonathan Blankley

Section
Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 57

Comment
It should be based on local housing need in order to provide housing that the local people want. The alternative is that housing is built to attract new people to the area, thus further pricing the local population out of the market. Given the age profile already in the area we need to keep young people, not attract even more retired couples who are selling their homes in more affluent areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>We believe that the housing built should be affordable for local residents and that the development of second and holiday homes should be very limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>john norris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>the housing market should dictate what is required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rentplus UK Ltd
Tetlow King Planning (-)

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1503

Comment The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to deliver a wide choice of homes. The mix and unit type proposed should be informed by the Council’s SHMA and other documents such as the Housing Register and any Local Housing Needs Surveys, ensuring that the needs of the District are met through provisions made in the Local Plan. It is useful for the Local Plan to set out the general needs of the District, rather than relying solely on market forces. The tenure mix should be strongly influenced by an understanding of local need, including aspirations towards home ownership that cannot currently be met due to poor affordability in Waveney. Rent to buy housing has significant capacity to assist households into home ownership by bridging the deposit ‘gap’; this not only helps those living in private rented accommodation, but also those currently living in other affordable homes which no longer suit their needs.
Robert Gill

Section  Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID  378

Comment  The housing market should dictate what is built, but with the proviso that developers must develop only within land identified within the plan, and not make continued speculative applications for land not identified within the plan for development. In other words, there should be a policy outlining where development is permitted, but then developers should be permitted to develop in line with market needs. The opportunities offered by the current building stock should be maximised, rather than uncontrolled building of new homes. This runs the risk of purchasers preferring new builds over and above existing stock.
### Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

**Section** | Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?  

**Comment ID** | 618  

**Comment** | Definitely needs to be based on housing need!!!
Simon Clack

Section Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 1650

Comment Rather than simply fulfilling quotas by allowing developers to build ever larger estates on green field sites, a more imaginative approach to housing issues is required. This could include: i/ taxes on empty properties similar to those levied in countries such as France and the Netherlands. I know of at least five properties in Reydon that have been empty for more than a year and I'm sure that there are many more in the area; ii/ measures to ensure that the proportion of holiday homes in a particular area does not reach unhealthy levels. The situation in Southwold, where 60% of homes are holiday/second homes, is clearly detrimental and shifts too great a burden onto Reydon; iii/ effective strategies to prevent key worker/affordable home schemes from being abused (cf article entitled "Affordable home put on market for £500,000" published by Building.co.uk on November 2nd 2011); and iv/ measures to encourage self-builders.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section  Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID  1288

Comment  Planning policies should continue to require a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section  Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID  1935

Comment  For reasons outside the scope of this response, the market does not deliver what is needed in housing. This necessitates retaining a policy that requires a mix of housing and types of housing based on assessments of local need.
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID 2178

Comment

Specialist housing and aging population

The County council is working closely with local authorities in order to meet the requirement set out in paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework ensuring that amongst others the local need for adequate care and health provision is addressed.

The reference to the ageing population is welcome. The county council will work further with the district to define what this may mean in terms of additional needs for housing and other facilities for older people. As well as the size and type of dwellings, the growth in older households may also influence the spatial distribution.

While the number of older people and number of older people with specialist housing needs is projected to increase significantly, older people are not the only group with specialist housing needs as the needs of adults and young adults should also be considered.

The county council would favour a continuation of a mix of supply being required based on assessed local need and would specifically encourage that assessment of need to include both the needs of an ageing population and other supported housing needs. The assessment of the mix of supply should also incorporate location - with access to services and the availability of public transport being a vital component.
Terry McDonald

Section  Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?

Comment ID  109

Comment  We need to focus our housing in two areas. The first are our immediate housing needs for an aging population and social housing, the second is for affordable family homes to attract new, younger affluent families from other parts of the UK and Europe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher</th>
<th>MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q30 Should we continue to have a policy that requires a mix and type of housing based on assessment of local need, or should the housing market dictate what mix and type of housing is built?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>No harm providing that a degree of common sense is applied taking into account changing market conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Comment ID 2014

Comment Self-build is difficult to incorporate in to larger housing developments unless sold as serviced plots. Where this does happen, there needs to be an element of "design coding with the plots to ensure some sort of compatibility. Self-builders are often trying to build dream houses on very tight budgets and often over extended timescales. This can often lead to proposals which are overdevelopment of plots and where construction takes 2-3 years. Such schemes need careful control. We are not convinced that the demand is as large as the government makes out and we should not be forced to sell land in to this market as a result of allocation. From a practical point of view self-build plots are best suited to sites with an existing road frontage and as such these are more often found in the more rural areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>SELF BUILD SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED BUT NOT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE. POSSIBLY EVEN ON OUTSKIRTS OF SMALL VILLAGES OR MARKET TOWNS BEYOND THE USUAL PHYSICAL LIMITS. AGAIN GETTING ANY FORM OF INVESTMENT IS DIFFICULT SO IF DEVELOPERS ARE ANTI SELF BUILD PLOT MAYBE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Comment ID 1106

Comment Self build plots should be provided as part of separate sites.
### Councillor Norman Brooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>as separate sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CTC John Thompson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>a) Support them under strict guidelines preventing them spoiling the attractiveness of localities. b) My response to a) means I'm inclined to support self-build plots..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G Golding

Section Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Comment ID 92

Comment Should be allowed and encouraged particularly eco homes and in small numbers, not as part of a wider development. Large and insensitive housing estates should be avoided in rural areas.
Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming

Section Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Comment ID 2088

Comment As the Council has already acknowledged, the evidence identifies that there is low demand for self build and those who wish to build their own homes have indicated that they would like individual plots in the Countryside. Gladman would not support a policy that would require all housing developments of a certain size to deliver a percentage of self build housing, as this would not reflect the current demand for Self Build development. Any policies relating to self-build development will need to be flexible and take into account viability issues to ensure that the deliverability of housing is not compromised. Further, those who are interested in building their own homes will unlikely wish to live on larger scale sites as mentioned above and may result in these self build plots on larger strategic sites failing to be implemented.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | a) Plots for self build should be available on the market  
b) Separate sites                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
Haycock

Section Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Comment ID 907

Comment Separate sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicky Elliott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>B) yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section  
Q31  a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Comment ID  58

Comment  
There should continue to be a mix. There are plenty of developers that have left sites derelict for a considerable time, so their concerns about timely completion are not entirely valid.
Section Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Comment ID 837

Comment self build plots should be provided on both individual sites and on larger developments under local authority planning control
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Difficult one. I don't think they should form part of bigger residential sites not just because of timeliness but also the creation of a lack of cohesion and good urban design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Comment ID 1936

Comment To achieve self-build, a mechanism is needed whereby land is provided at a below market cost. The cost of land is the chief inhibitor. Incorporating self-build sites within larger commercial developments is a way for to dilute the "sameness" of commercially developed estates.
Webb Information Technology Services Ltd Tony Tibbenham

Section Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Comment ID 287

Comment Keep self build and larger developments separate. Use existing estate agencies and technologies to promote these plots. Encourage self build cooperatives for small developments of greater than one household.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section Q31 a) How should plots for self build be provided? b) Should self build plots be provided as part of larger housing developments, or as separate sites?

Comment ID 1446

Comment As part of larger sites would offer more chance I suppose of promoting self build but is there really sufficient demand?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Affordable housing usually means low standard homes and I am no in favour of this. I believe in a property owning democracy and think this should be encouraged for individuals and not landlords.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section  Affordable housing

Comment ID  59

Comment  There is a lack of affordable housing, and the current policy does not really address the problem. Developments should reflect the local need, and there is a need for affordable housing. However in the past even where smaller properties have been built, a number of these have been bought by buy-to-let landlords and appeared for rent at market rates, thus remaining unaffordable. The way to address this is to build more of these homes therefore reducing their demand, and hence the rents achieved. Also there need to be more schemes to prioritise these properties for local buyers who wish to live in them rather than investors just out to make money.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terry McDonald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wendy Summerfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Affordable housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Affordable housing should mean starter homes or homes to downsize to, houses which are affordable NOT social housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 2015

Comment Any increase in this percentage will see development falter or more viability submissions with planning applications.
**Section**
Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

**Comment ID**
266

**Comment**
REALISTICALLY INVESTORS DO NOT WANT TO BE INVOLVED WITH AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR A WHOLE HOST OF REASONS. IF THE COUNCIL WANTS THE PRIVATE SECTOR TO BUILD IT HAS TO ACCEPT THAT. I ACCEPT THAT IT IS PART OF THE CURRENT GOVERNMENTS POLICY TO DESTROY SOCIAL HOUSING BUT WITHOUT A CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT WHAT CAN BE DONE?
IT WOULD BE INTERESTING TO KNOW IF THE LOW HOUSING COMPLETION NUMBERS IN THE LAST 3 YEARS ARE TIED IN WITH THIS POLICY.
TO HELP HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS THEY SHOULD BE THE ONE EXCEPTION TO DEVELOPING OUTSIDE TIGHT PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES OF DEVELOPMENT AREAS.
ANOTHER SOLUTION MIGHT BE TO GET DEVELOPERS TO BUILD THE SOCIAL HOUSING ON A SEPARATE SITE NEARBY. PROBABLY BEST IF PLANNING PERMISSION REQUIRES IT TO BE COMPLETED FIRST.
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 1539

Comment Please note that it is intended that the Broads Authority Local Plan defers to the district’s policy on affordable housing as is the case currently.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Councillor Norman Brooks**

**Section**

Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

**Comment ID** 1819

**Comment**

35% far to high stopping suitable development, needs sensible sustainable figures
G Golding

Section  Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID  93

Comment  it has shown in the Reydon area that affordable homes have not attracted 2nd time buyers within that bracket, and these have then been sold on the open market as yet more holiday homes. Affordable housing policy seems to push through a development that is not really meeting any real need for growth in housing in that specific area.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 1720

Comment 35% is ok
John Trew

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 22

Comment Affordable housing is certainly a priority but should not mean they are built on top of each other otherwise car parking will become a major issue for those living there. Starter homes should remain as starter homes with car ports and not garages, otherwise the garage will be used for living and cars will park on the roads.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 1836

Comment Affordable Housing is one of the main priorities in Kessingland. In June 2015 a Housing Needs Survey was undertaken in Kessingland by Community Action Suffolk on behalf of the Neighbourhood Planning Team. 89% of those taking part in the survey were in favour of an affordable housing scheme and of those who provided a response

- 42 households have a current housing need in Kessingland, totalling 70 people
- 16 households have a need to return to Kessingland, totalling 30 people

The Gateway to Home Choice register indicates there are 63 households claiming a local connection to Kessingland.

In August 2014 the Waveney Housing Register showed 101 people with a local connection to Kessingland, either by virtue of living or working in Kessingland or by having close family there.

The housing register does not give a complete picture as it changes all the time and many people choose not to put themselves on the register if they do not think there is much chance of securing a property. However, it is clear that there are considerable needs in Kessingland from people with a local connection to the parish.

The Neighbourhood Plan showed that nearly 75% of 31-63 year olds were looking to stay in Kessingland over the next ten years but nearly half would not be able to afford the cost of housing.

An important consideration when allocating affordable housing is the social impact of placing people without local connections in a rural community such as Kessingland. Where people with a local connection have expressed a desire to live in the parish they would integrate better with the existing community and therefore should be given the opportunity to take an affordable property when one became available.

It is therefore considered important that when new development is brought forward in Kessingland which delivers affordable housing, that these affordable units are where possible offered to people with a local connection to Kessingland. The land at Laurel Farm East (SA3) is to be delivered as a site for 100% affordable housing to be retained in perpetuity for people with a local connection. The 25 dwellings will not address all of
the identified local needs; the other two sites are expected to deliver a further 20 making a total of 45 over all three sites.
Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 2158

Comment In terms of affordable housing, the Council should set a policy requirement based on the requirement established through the SHMA. It should be acknowledged that the delivery of this target is subject to viability, particularly given the introduction of a non-negotiable CIL charging schedule which limits the scope for other contributions to be negotiated when sites are subject to abnormal costs.
Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 1070

Comment The Council's current requirement for a minimum 35% of new dwellings to be affordable is high and is likely to impact on the ability for developers to provide policy compliant affordable housing on many sites. In order to identify an appropriate target, the Council need to prepare the necessary evidence and this should be published as part of the Evidence Base of the new Local Plan and made available for public consultation. When preparing the evidence, the Council should have regard to the NPPF and the requirement for affordable housing policies to be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time (paragraph 50).

Any affordable housing thresholds set should be subject to financial viability considerations to ensure that all suitable sites can be developed without affordable housing requirements rendering constrained development sites unviable. Viability considerations should also take account of affordable housing tenures and the associated splits that developers are required to provide.

Whatever the Council consider to be the appropriate percentage of affordable housing to be included in new developments, this should be set as a target rather than a minimum requirement. This will allow for viability considerations and prevent restricting development on constrained but otherwise highly sustainable sites.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section  Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 1243

Comment
The Council’s current requirement for a minimum of 35% of new dwellings to be affordable is high and is likely to impact on the ability for developers to provide policy compliant affordable housing on many sites. In order to identify an appropriate target, the Council need to prepare the necessary evidence and this should be published as part of the Evidence Base of the new Local Plan and made available for public consultation. When preparing the evidence, the Council should have regard to the NPPF and the requirement for affordable housing policies to be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time (paragraph 50).

Any affordable housing thresholds set should be subject to financial viability considerations to ensure that all suitable sites can be developed without affordable housing requirements rendering constrained development sites unviable. Viability considerations should also take account of affordable housing tenures and the associated splits that developers are required to provide.

Whatever the Council consider to be the appropriate percentage of affordable housing to be included in new developments, this should be set as a target rather than a minimum requirement. This will allow for viability considerations and prevent restricting development on constrained but otherwise highly sustainable sites.

In considering and drafting new policy on affordable housing, the Council will need to incorporate the addition to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published on 19 May 2016 relating to Vacant Building Credit (Planning Obligations chapter, paragraphs 021 to 023). The policy has been introduced to incentivise brownfield development and enables a credit to be applied against the floorspace of any vacant buildings on the site, which should be used as a relief against affordable housing.
Haycock

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 908

Comment I think this percentage should reflect local needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicky Elliott

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 729

Comment Continue with 35% policy at least.
Norman Castleton

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 433

Comment Lower
Pamela Cyprien

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 1265

Comment Continue with existing policy of 35 per cent
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 60

Comment If anything the percentage should probably be increased, but this should be determined by local need. If we wish to maintain a balanced community, then future developments should primarily benefit the community and not the developers.
Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 838

Comment the percentage of affordable homes should be part of the local plan however these should be for purchase and not for rent
Rentplus UK Ltd
Tetlow King Planning (-)

Section: Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID: 1504

Comment: Rentplus can help meet the needs of households aspiring to home ownership but currently locked out of both affordable and market housing, extending the opportunity of home ownership to those otherwise trapped in expensive private rented accommodation or inappropriately housed in social rented housing. This model enables those not currently able to save to rent at an affordable level, whilst living in a Housing Association maintained home to save for the deposit to purchase the home. This helps move households out of private rented accommodation, those living with parents, and also to make the move from social rented housing where this no longer suits their needs.

As set out in the accompanying Affordable Housing Statement, the Government has pledged to deliver 400,000 affordable houses by 2020-21, with a focus on low cost home ownership, including supply of "10,000 homes that will allow a tenant to save for a deposit while they rent." As a rent to buy model Rentplus will enhance the affordable housing already being delivered in Northampton either as a standalone product or as part of the overall affordable housing offer on mixed development sites. This is crucial at a time when there is such high local need for affordable housing, and as Government funding for social rented housing is uncertain. To ensure that the Local Plan is compliant with existing and emerging planning policy it is important that any proposed policies concerning and definitions of affordable take into account rent to buy affordable housing. Policies should be drafted to ensure developments provide an appropriate mix of housing that suitably responds to both housing needs and aspirations.

The Council’s current target affordable homes requirement of 35% should in any case be applied flexibly. It is important that the Council recognises that the introduction of Starter Homes and other innovative models such as Rentplus is likely to require flexibility on tenure mix. Following the Court of Appeal judgement in the case of CLG v West Berkshire and Reading Councils (2016) the Government’s guidance in the PPG was reinstated; this sets national thresholds below which affordable housing should no longer be required. It is particularly important at this stage of reviewing the Local Plan...
for the Council to consider whether it has local evidence that justifies a lower threshold (as with the existing adopted Local Plan) at which it will require affordable housing delivery, or whether to simply adopt the national guideline threshold. No matter what the evidence suggests, it will remain important for the Council to prioritise delivery of affordable housing in all its forms.

It is also important, as already noted, to take into account other emerging changes to national policy. Whilst the Council has indicated that it will develop a Starter Homes policy, rent to buy affordable housing needs to be brought within the scope of the Plan policies in accordance with the likely changes to the NPPF. The Council needs to adapt readily to these changes. One way in which the Council may benefit from flexibility is using a policy that recognises the financial benefits of rent to buy delivery. Due to the ready availability of private funding for Rentplus there is significant scope for early delivery where this would both improve overall site viability and encourage quicker development. This can be important on strategic sites where early delivery can help bring forward infrastructure in a timely fashion.
Rentplus UK Ltd
Tetlow King Planning (-)

Section
Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID
1510

Comment
We represent Rentplus, a company providing an innovative affordable housing model aimed at delivering discounted rented homes to buy for people who are unable to acquire a property on the open market but also trapped by ineligibility for existing affordable housing tenures.

Enclosed with this consultation response is an Affordable Housing Statement by Tetlow King Planning setting out the model's compliance with the NPPF definition of affordable housing and how this should be incorporated into local plans to boost supply and meet local needs. We ask that this be read alongside our representation so that the Council's strategic approach to housing delivery takes into account this innovative model which has the capacity to meet a significant level of unmet need locally.

These points contribute towards boosting the Council’s affordable housing provision, as well as supporting the Government’s ambition to extend opportunities for affordable home ownership. Should the Council consider it useful, a meeting between relevant officers and Rentplus would assist in discussing the practical implications of delivering Rentplus homes, in particular in relation to the ongoing assessment of affordable housing deliverability, and the use of a Memorandum in Waveney.
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 2073

Comment We believe, on the basis of the evidence available on housing need locally, that the priority for any new housing needs to be the development of smaller affordable or low cost units suited to the needs of younger people/families and older people/couples needing smaller and accessible accommodation. For this reason we believe the 35% quota for affordable housing in all new developments should be retained in the new Local Plan. However, achieving long term affordable housing in Southwold and Reydon (as elsewhere) is very difficult - as is ensuring that it goes to local people. In addition, around 50% of new housing in this area, including a significant proportion of new affordable housing, in the last ten or so years has quickly ended up as second homes or holiday lets. Therefore, building new houses in our locality may frequently fail to meet the needs of the local community.
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section  Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID  620

Comment  I think you should relate this to land and house prices, demand and wages and have different percentages. For example, Beccles is more expensive than South Lowestoft and therefore should require a higher percentage as profit levels are higher.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 1289

Comment The existing policy of requiring 35% of new homes to be affordable for rent or shared ownership should be continued.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 1425

Comment 4. How Should New Housing be Planned in Southwold and Reydon?
b. We believe, on the basis of the evidence available on housing need locally, that the priority for any new housing needs to be the development of smaller affordable or low cost units suited to the needs of younger people/families and older people/couples needing smaller and accessible accommodation. For this reason we believe the 35% quota for affordable housing in all new developments should be retained in the new Local Plan. It also follows that new development should include a mix of housing type with a strong emphasis on one and two bedroom units.
c. However, achieving long term affordable housing in Southwold and Reydon (as elsewhere) is very difficult - as is ensuring that it goes to local people. In addition, around 50% of new housing in this area, including a significant proportion of new affordable housing, in the last ten or so years has quickly ended up as second homes or holiday lets. Therefore, building new houses in our locality may frequently fail to meet the needs of the local community.
d. As stated above, we believe the majority of the proposed increase in housing needed across the District should be located in Lowestoft and Beccles, given that these are the main areas of employment. If this approach is taken in the Local Plan, the housing target for Southwold and Reydon would be at the lower end of the range set out in the consultation.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>35% should be retained and consideration should be given to increasing the percentage depending on local conditions. For example, in Southwold, over 90% of new development is bought by the second home/holiday let/buy to invest market. So new development is not satisfying the need for primary residences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terry McDonald

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 111

Comment How many social houses are needed to give everyone currently on the waiting list a house? That should be the basis to answering this question. I suspect a figure nearer 70% for social and affordable housing would be more accurate.
Again, ignoring social and just looking and affordable and part-buy, we should be focusing on more of this type of housing to attract the right type of people from other areas needed to generate growth.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section Q32 Do you think we should continue with the existing policy to require that 35% of new homes are affordable homes for rent or shared ownership? Or should we set a different percentage?

Comment ID 1447

Comment Obviously 35% is a tad optimistic given the Governments Starter Home initiative so I suspect this level needs to be reduced and viability taken into account
Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

Comment ID
2016

Comment
The recent Court of Appeal decision has resolved this in favour of sites over 10.
**Benacre Estates Company Edward Vere Nicoll**  
*Savills (Philip Rankin)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>In accordance with the NPPG (ID 23b-031-20160519), affordable housing contributions should not be sought on developments of 10 units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm. The threshold for affordable housing should therefore be increased to 11 homes so that it complies with national policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

Comment ID 1108

Comment 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>5 is ok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**John and Barbara Carter**

**Section**

Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

**Comment ID**

1516

**Comment**

It is important that any new developments include some low cost houses, which we understand will be partially provided for in Duncan's Yard and some other sites in Southwold.
**John Trew**

**Section**
Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

**Comment ID**
23

**Comment**
A mix of housing, both affordable and private homes is desirable.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

Comment ID 1071

Comment The current threshold for 35% of affordable housing to be provided on schemes of 5 units or more is considered to be too low and is restricting to small scale development. When the Council are preparing their evidence on the appropriate percentage of affordable housing to be provided, consideration should also be given to the appropriate threshold of dwellings to trigger affordable housing provision.

It is important to note the revision to National Planning Practice Guidance on 19 May 2016 which identified that small scale and self-build developments of 10 units or less (can be 5 units in rural areas) should be exempt from including affordable housing provided that they have a maximum combined gross floorspace of less than 1000sqm (Ref ID: 23b-031-20160519). Based upon this change to national guidance, it is considered that as a starting point the threshold should be changed to only require affordable housing to apply to schemes comprising 10 dwellings or more.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Question (Q33)
What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

Comment ID 1244

Comment The current threshold for 35% of affordable housing to be provided on schemes of 5 units or more is considered to be too low and is restricting to small scale development. When the Council are preparing their evidence on the appropriate percentage of affordable housing to be provided, consideration should also be given to the appropriate threshold of dwellings to trigger affordable housing provision.

It is important to note the revision to NPPG on 19 May 2016 which identified that small scale and self-build developments of 10 units or less (can be 5 units in rural areas) should be exempt from including affordable housing provided that they have a maximum combined gross floorspace of less than 1000sqm (Ref ID: 23b-031-20160519). Based upon this change to national guidance, it is considered that as a starting point the threshold should be changed to only require affordable housing to apply to schemes comprising 10 dwellings or more.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haycock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Norman Castleton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pamela Cyprien

Section  Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

Comment ID  1266

Comment  Keep the current threshold of 5.
### Jonathan Blankley

**Section**  
Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

**Comment ID**  
61

**Comment**  
That depends on whether developers are manipulating the sizes of sites to keep within that threshold. On balance it is probably right if everyone is playing by the rules. Having said that it is important to look at the larger picture to ensure that the right mix of properties is being built. If the sites available are predominately under the threshold, and too many larger properties are being built, then there is a strong case for reducing it.
**john norris**

**Section**

Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

**Comment ID**

839

**Comment**

affordable homes should be built where they are needed and desired and not as a matter of site size
Rentplus UK Ltd
Tetlow King Planning (-)

Section Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

Comment ID 1505

Comment
Rentplus can help meet the needs of households aspiring to home ownership but currently locked out of both affordable and market housing, extending the opportunity of home ownership to those otherwise trapped in expensive private rented accommodation or inappropriately housed in social rented housing. This model enables those not currently able to save to rent at an affordable level, whilst living in a Housing Association maintained home to save for the deposit to purchase the home. This helps move households out of private rented accommodation, those living with parents, and also to make the move from social rented housing where this no longer suits their needs.

As set out in the accompanying Affordable Housing Statement, the Government has pledged to deliver 400,000 affordable houses by 2020-21, with a focus on low cost home ownership, including supply of "10,000 homes that will allow a tenant to save for a deposit while they rent." As a rent to buy model Rentplus will enhance the affordable housing already being delivered in Northampton either as a standalone product or as part of the overall affordable housing offer on mixed development sites. This is crucial at a time when there is such high local need for affordable housing, and as Government funding for social rented housing is uncertain. To ensure that the Local Plan is compliant with existing and emerging planning policy it is important that any proposed policies concerning and definitions of affordable take into account rent to buy affordable housing. Policies should be drafted to ensure developments provide an appropriate mix of housing that suitably responds to both housing needs and aspirations.

The Council’s current target affordable homes requirement of 35% should in any case be applied flexibly. It is important that the Council recognises that the introduction of Starter Homes and other innovative models such as Rentplus is likely to require flexibility on tenure mix. Following the Court of Appeal judgement in the case of CLG v West Berkshire and Reading Councils (2016) the Government’s guidance in the PPG was reinstated; this sets national thresholds below which affordable housing should no longer be required. It is particularly important at this stage of reviewing the Local Plan
for the Council to consider whether it has local evidence that justifies a lower threshold (as with the existing adopted Local Plan) at which it will require affordable housing delivery, or whether to simply adopt the national guideline threshold. No matter what the evidence suggests, it will remain important for the Council to prioritise delivery of affordable housing in all its forms.

It is also important, as already noted, to take into account other emerging changes to national policy. Whilst the Council has indicated that it will develop a Starter Homes policy, rent to buy affordable housing needs to be brought within the scope of the Plan policies in accordance with the likely changes to the NPPF. The Council needs to adapt readily to these changes. One way in which the Council may benefit from flexibility is using a policy that recognises the financial benefits of rent to buy delivery. Due to the ready availability of private funding for Rentplus there is significant scope for early delivery where this would both improve overall site viability and encourage quicker development. This can be important on strategic sites where early delivery can help bring forward infrastructure in a timely fashion.
Robert Gill

Section Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?

Comment ID 379

Comment We fully accept that affordable housing is required but it should be of sympathetic design. Our view is that whilst some affordable should be provided in the villages and market towns, that the main focus should be in Lowestoft. This would be congruent with the option one proposal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>To set the threshold at 5 is in breach of the Government's recent appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q33 What size site should provide affordable housing? Should we continue with the current threshold of 5 homes or set a different threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The current threshold of five homes should be kept, but in places like Southwold where there is limited land for development, a lower threshold should be permitted, and not only through Neighbourhood Plans, which may have been enacted before the new Local Plan is in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID
2017

Comment
It is likely that forthcoming changes to the NPPF will make this the case, when the definition of affordable housing is amended. The Act and the technical guidance are likely to make it clear that Starter Homes have primacy over other forms of affordable housing.
brian may

Section  
Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 267

Comment  
NEED TO BE ADDITIONAL TO AFFORDABLE HOMES AS THIS IS JUST A GIMMICK TO BOLSTER FAILING FIRST TIME BUYER NUMBERS IN THE HOUSING MARKET.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 1109

Comment In addition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Councillor Norman Brooks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 1722

Comment starter homes should be part of the overall affordable homes provision
John Trew

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 24

Comment Starter homes are important and, again, should be mixed in with other types of housing with adequate parking facilities.
Larkfleet Homes  
Seth Williams

**Section**  
Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

**Comment ID**  
2159

**Comment**  
With respect to starter homes, it is apparent from the Department of Communities and Local Government's ongoing 'Starter Homes Regulations' technical consultation that it is the Government's intention for starter homes to be considered a new type of affordable housing provision. We would support this view on the basis that starter homes present an attractive form of affordable home ownership which can be readily and more viably delivered than other affordable housing products. It is evident that affordability is a significant constraint to home ownership in the area. During our public exhibition, the possibility of providing starter homes to enable local people to own their own home was particularly well-received. The provision of starter homes, which Larkfleet's development would propose to deliver, a significant element is therefore considered highly desirable and should therefore not be supplanted by other affordable housing products.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 1072

Comment When deciding upon an appropriate affordable housing requirement it is essential for the Council to give consideration to the inclusion of Starter Homes. Should the Council decide to include Starter Homes as part of the overall affordable housing requirement, it is important that the affordable housing threshold is not increased to account for Starter Homes as this would render developments unviable. Instead, Starter Homes should form part of the mix of the identified affordable housing requirement. If the Council decide that Starter Homes should be provided in addition to affordable housing, and not as part of the affordable housing mix, then the affordable housing threshold should be reduced accordingly to ensure developments remain viable.

The preferred approach is for Starter Homes to comprise a proportion of the overall affordable housing requirement. Evidence on the requirement for Starter Homes should be prepared by the Council and should be subject to consultation as part of the Local Plan process.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 1245

Comment When deciding upon an appropriate affordable housing requirement it is essential for the Council to give consideration to the inclusion of Starter Homes. Should the Council decide to include Starter Homes as part of the overall affordable housing requirement, it is important that the affordable housing threshold is not increased to account for Starter Homes as this would render developments unviable. Instead, Starter Homes should form part of the mix of the identified affordable housing requirement.

If the Council decide that Starter Homes should be provided in addition to affordable housing, and not as part of the affordable housing mix, then the affordable housing threshold should be reduced accordingly to ensure developments remain viable.

The preferred approach is for Starter Homes to comprise a proportion of the overall affordable housing requirement. Evidence on the requirement for Starter Homes should be prepared by the Council and should be subject to consultation as part of the Local Plan process.
**Haycock**

**Section**  
Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

**Comment ID**  
910

**Comment**  
Additional, providing the percentage of affordable housing is set according to local needs and not according to a District prescription.
Anne McClarnon

Section
Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID
673

Comment
I think they should be in addition. As you say, there is a concern that after 5 years in first-time ownership, they get subsumed into the overall housing market and then we’re back to square one.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicky Elliott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 435

Comment Cannot understand the distinction but part of the affordable homes percentage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 62

Comment In this area a £250,000 home is not an affordable one, so shouldn't be counted as such, whether discounted or not. If smaller starter homes are built at a genuinely affordable value, then there is a case for including these within the affordable housing provision. Based on local house prices that figure would need to be around £100,000 lower than the government's figure.
John Norris

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 840

Comment starter homes should be part of any housing requirement scheme provided quality of build and longevity of structure is maintained. Starter homes should replace properties for rent wherever possible.
Rentplus UK Ltd
Tetlow King Planning (-)

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 1506

Comment We note that the Housing and Planning Act 2016 allows for a tapering of the discount that may be received upon sale of a Starter Home; the Regulations are expected to be produced this summer, at which time there will be greater certainty for the Council in developing its policy. In order for the Local Plan to be in line with existing policy however, it needs to explicitly recognise the introduction of Starter Homes as part of the overall affordable housing requirement. As set out in our response to questions 32-33, rent to buy affordable housing should also be recognised. We recommend the inclusion of wording indicating the adoption of a flexible approach to tenure mix that responds to local circumstances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?</td>
<td>Starter homes should be part of the overall affordable housing requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>It also includes injured and ex servicemen and women. I think they should be an additional requirement to affordable homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Starter homes should be an additional requirement to the 35% affordable housing requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 1939

Comment We are not sure what this question means. However, we are strongly of the view that local authorities not be required to build starter homes in place of other types of social housing. Local communities, community land trusts and housing associations should be able to determine what type of affordable house is needed locally.
Terry McDonald

Section Q34 Should 'Starter Homes' be part of the overall affordable housing requirement? Or should starter homes be an additional requirement above affordable housing provision?

Comment ID 112

Comment We should put greater focus on Social Housing firstm then affordable housing second. Starter homes should be included over and above those other requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q35 Should some sites be allocated specifically for starter homes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Possibly on a small scale but not on sites of more than 10 as this creates a very unbalanced community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q35 Should some sites be allocated specifically for starter homes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>integrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q35 Should some sites be allocated specifically for starter homes?

Comment ID 1822

Comment No as part of main site/development but do not charge CIL on them
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q35 Should some sites be allocated specifically for starter homes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley beevor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q35 Should some sites be allocated specifically for starter homes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>no - diversity is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haycock</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q35 Should some sites be allocated specifically for starter homes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Anne McClarnon**

**Section** Q35 Should some sites be allocated specifically for starter homes?

**Comment ID** 674

**Comment** I'm not in favour of this. I think a wide housing mix makes more sense. Whilst some older residents may prefer to live away from children and young people, others would prefer to be embedded in their communities and not hived off into ghettos.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicky Elliott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section  Q35 Should some sites be allocated specifically for starter homes?

Comment ID  63

Comment  Yes if appropriate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>john norris</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rentplus UK Ltd
Tetlow King Planning (-)

Section Q35 Should some sites be allocated specifically for starter homes?

Comment ID 1507

Comment We note that the Housing and Planning Act 2016 allows for a tapering of the discount that may be received upon sale of a Starter Home; the Regulations are expected to be produced this summer, at which time there will be greater certainty for the Council in developing its policy. In order for the Local Plan to be in line with existing policy however, it needs to explicitly recognise the introduction of Starter Homes as part of the overall affordable housing requirement. As set out in our response to questions 32-33, rent to buy affordable housing should also be recognised. We recommend the inclusion of wording indicating the adoption of a flexible approach to tenure mix that responds to local circumstances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert Gill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellington Construction Ltd  Paul Pitcher  
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section: Q35 Should some sites be allocated specifically for starter homes?

Comment ID: 1448

Comment: No
Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section

Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID

2019

Comment

Yes
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID 1111

Comment Yes, by planning policy and not allocated sites
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section       Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID   1823

Comment      As now
Section Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID 187

Comment On balance, continue with current policy
Environment Agency

Section Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID 2105

Comment To accompany this section of your Local Plan it is very important to consider flood risk for these sites and to apply the sequential and exception tests. The Local Plan is a good opportunity to encourage these sites to register for with our Flood Warning Direct (FWD) service and encourage them to have flood plans where they are at risk. A policy on waste water disposal would also be beneficial to prevent harm to the environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Graham and Sue Bergin</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID 1351

Comment Gypsies and Travellers needs will be assessed through the Greater Norwich Local Plan, and Greater Norwich officers think there could be some benefits in having a meeting to discuss the matter with Waveney officers, to ensure that any wider strategic issues (any potential new transit site, for example) are considered.
The greater certainty of being able to meet the identified need for additional gypsy and traveller pitches through a specific allocation probably militates slightly in favour of this approach rather than relying solely on the criteria-based policy.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID 1724

Comment The current policy criteria are appropriate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Bumpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne McClarnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicky Elliott

Section Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID 733

Comment Sites need to be allocated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID 64

Comment The current policy seems appropriate, however users of these sites should contribute to the local economy by paying a council tax fee that covers the cost of the sites, their future maintenance, and the costs of any clear up in or around them.
Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

the criteria for traveller sites should not include the need for easy access to schools and services which travellers do not pay for. Sites should be made available for short term stay only - rent payable - and include necessities such as water sewerage waste bins etc.
Robert Gill

Section Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID 382

Comment Sites should be not be identified in advance. This will have a detrimental affect on house values in the immediate area.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q36 Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current

Comment ID 1941

Comment Continue existing criteria, which gives appropriate flexibility.
Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Carlton Colville Town Council is unable to give any answers to questions 37 to 47 but will continue at question 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?

Comment ID 1825

Comment No decide each case on its merits
CTC John Thompson

Section Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?

Comment ID 188

Comment yes
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Bumpus

Section Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?

Comment ID 594

Comment No. The conversion of houses to flats meets a housing need that cannot be addresses through other means.
lesley beevor

Section  Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?

Comment ID  784

Comment  yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?

Comment ID 437

Comment Flat conversion of properties needs to be strictly controlled for the reasons stated above
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

Section Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?

Comment ID 1194

Comment Definitely
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul Douch</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
john norris

Section Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?

Comment ID 843

Comment yes
Robert Gill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes, but there should be opportunities within the policy for flats to be used as affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q37 Do you think we should continue to identify areas where the conversion of properties to flats will be controlled by planning policy?

Comment ID 1942

Comment In Southwold, the incentive to convert larger older properties into flats is linked to the buy to holiday let market as opposed to the provision of low cost housing; Southwold residents identify similar associated detrimental impacts on neighbours from parking, noise, and disturbance. The dwelling inventory below shows the following houses (H) converted to flats (F) by road.

Chester 4H x 8F (i.e. 4 houses converted into 8 flats)
East Cliff 2H x 4F
Fieldstile 4H x 9F
Hotson 4H x 8F
Lorne 3H x 6F
Marlborough 8H x 16F
North Parade 6H x 12F
North Road 5H x 10F
Pier Ave 8H x 20F
South Green 3H x 6F
St Edmunds 1H x 2F
Stradbroke 5H x 12F
Victoria 4H x 8F
Total 57H x 121F

We urge that the concept of flat saturation be applied to conversions that break larger homes into holiday lets and that, as part of a further stage of local plan consultation, communities be invited to identify "holiday let" saturation areas.
Q38 What areas should be identified as 'Flat Saturation Area' where further flat conversions will be controlled?

Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q38 What areas should be identified as 'Flat Saturation Area' where further flat conversions will be controlled?

Comment ID 1826

Comment No decide each case on its merits
Anne McClarnon

Section Q38 What areas should be identified as 'Flat Saturation Area' where further flat conversions will be controlled?

Comment ID 677

Comment Apart from those already indicated, I think anywhere where the housing stock is particularly densely packed and/or where parking and services might come under pressure should be considered for further controls. I’m also in favour of the wider awareness of environmental and housing/community mix considerations.
**North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q38 What areas should be identified as 'Flat Saturation Area' where further flat conversions will be controlled?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Town centre, Marine Parade, London Road South area etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q39 What criteria should we use to determine planning applications for conversion of properties to flats?

Councillor Norman Brooks

Section  Q39 What criteria should we use to determine planning applications for conversion of properties to flats?

Comment ID  1827

Comment  Need and sustainability of property in question.
Anne McClarnon

Section | Q39 What criteria should we use to determine planning applications for conversion of properties to flats?

Comment ID | 678

Comment | There needs to be decent noise-reduction considerations (within the flats and outside) implicit on any approved planning. Also, parking, safety and flooding mitigations should be part of any planning application. Finally, flats should be of a decent size: multiple occupancy of small flats is unacceptable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicky Elliott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>john norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes if it can be used as a way of cross funding local needs housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
brian may

Section Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?

Comment ID 268

Comment NO IT WILL BE THE THIN END OF THE WEDGE.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?

Comment ID 1829

Comment Yes starter homes
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Bumpus

Section Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?

Comment ID 595

Comment Only where the infrastructure to support the development is present. Crucially, public transport.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicky Elliott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>john norris</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rentplus UK Ltd
Tetlow King Planning (-)

Section Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?

Comment ID 1508

Comment The NPPF allows for the direct cross-subsidy of affordable housing delivery on rural exception sites; the Council should ensure that its policy on these sites allows for this where a site has viability constraints.

As a wider point, the Council should permit the delivery of affordable housing wherever this will meet local affordable housing need and this is within a sustainable location, as set out within the NPPF. Restricting the delivery of any tenure of affordable housing is unhelpful to those seeking to meet local needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert Gill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?

Comment ID 1943

Comment Yes, but only if the ratio of affordable to market is 50% or more, the primary purpose of providing market is to cross-subsidize the affordable homes, and the market homes will be used for full time residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q40 Should we allow market housing on rural affordable housing exception sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>sensible strategy to facilitate Aff housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?

Comment ID 2022

Comment Ideally yes but we don't live in an ideal world.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>brian may</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong> 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> IF FOLK NEED AFFORDABLE HOUSING IT WOULD SEEM UNFAIR TO BURDEN THEM WITH UNNECESSARY TRANSPORT COSTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Norman Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Bumpus

Section Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?

Comment ID 596

Comment Yes.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section

Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?

Comment ID 1839

Comment

The land at Laurel Farm East (draft policy SA3) is to be delivered as a site for 100% affordable housing, to be retained in perpetuity for people with a local connection to Kessingland. This will be secured through legal agreement to be signed by Waveney District Council, the registered provider and the developer (if necessary).

However, as the Rural Housing Needs Survey has shown, the 25 dwellings proposed here will not address all of the identified local needs. It is therefore important that other sites deliver affordable housing. The two other site allocations (SA1 and SA2) are expected to deliver a further 20 affordable units between them, bringing the total to 45 affordable units over the three sites.

Infill development involves the development of a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage. It usually consists of frontage plots and often comprises side gardens of existing houses.

One of the particular issues raised by the community of Kessingland has been the over bearing nature of some infill developments. Over recent years new housing has predominantly come through infill development. In the past there have been some infill developments which have been permitted on very small plots at high densities, creating issues of amenity for neighbouring properties.

For this reason the draft policy H2 is proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan to meet the communities concerns about infill development.
Anne McClarnon

Section  
Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?

Comment ID  679

Comment  Yes
Nicky Elliott

Section Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?

Comment ID 736

Comment Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>john norris</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robert Gill

Section Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?

Comment ID 385

Comment Yes, but with the proviso that it should respect the physical limits requirements within the current local plan, taking all opportunities for infill site where possible, rather productive farming land.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Rural affordable housing exception sites should be limited to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section Q41 Should we only allow rural affordable housing exception sites next to villages with good accessibility to services and facilities?

Comment ID 1450

Comment No

Given advances in technology on motor car fuel consumption and energy efficiency and no doubt further progress in the future then reliance on motor vehicles will become less problematic; then could the LPA become pro active rather than re active in this respect particularly when considering development sites in areas where a range of facilities may be spread over several villages or where there is a need to travel to towns for such facilities?.
Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

Comment ID 2023

Comment Yes but you need to be more consistent in your application of this policy.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section
Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

Comment ID
1831

Comment
Yes a lot of these areas will never get public transport or shops etc but people still need to live in these areas
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section
Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

Comment ID 1728

Comment
a) yes
b) yes
John Bumpus

Section  Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

Comment ID  597

Comment  a) Yes  
b) Yes
Anne McClarnon

Section Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

Comment ID 680

Comment a) Yes
b) I think we might be able to be more flexible, given the number of dwellings potentially within this proposal.
### Nicky Elliott

**Section**

Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>737</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Comment     | a) yes.  
b) yes. |
Norman Castleton

Section Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

Comment ID 440

Comment Yes
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

**Section**

Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

**Comment ID**

1197

**Comment**

Villages are being ruined by infill of large houses in small gardens without regard for the street scene. Public transport is rarely used and it means more car use
Peter Eyres

Section Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

Comment ID 1419

Comment a) Yes.
b) No. If you don’t allow housing development in villages, you cannot then complain if facilities such as shops and pubs close down and buses no longer run there and the village effectively dies. However, developments should, first, take the form of sensitive infill and, second, modest groups sensitively fitted into the village environment: the small estate on the eastern edge of Wissett is a perfect example of how not to do it – an urban development dropped onto the edge of a rural village, prominent and inappropriate. Do you really need urban-style streetlights if the rest of the village does not have them, or, similarly, kerbed footways instead of grass verges?
John Norris

Section Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

Comment ID 847

Comment a-yes b- no
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert Gill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities

Comment ID 1945

Comment In-fill in the built up frontages of villages should be permitted subject to sympathetic design that takes advantage of every opportunity to improve the character of the area, and providing there is access to public transport, local services and facilities.
| Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher  
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 a) Should we continue to allow small scale development within gaps in the built up frontages in the rural areas? b) If so should this type of development only be allowed where there is access to public transport or local services and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q43 a) Should we set out detailed criteria for establishing whether a new agricultural workers dwellings is needed? b) If so what should this criteria include?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q43 a) Should we set out detailed criteria for establishing whether a new agricultural workers dwellings is needed? b) If so what should this criteria include?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes – but there needs to be a proper assessment of need and viability of the enterprise first and perhaps a requirement to have lived on site in temporary accommodation for at least 3 years before an application will be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barnby Parish Council Ian Hinton

Section Q43 a) Should we set out detailed criteria for establishing whether a new agricultural workers dwellings is needed? b) If so what should this criteria include?

Comment ID 2186

Comment Conversion of redundant agricultural buildings
We recognize the value of re-purposing buildings that have become redundant due to changes in farming methods or type, but examples are occurring of applications for conversion to holiday lets of buildings which have never been used for their permitted agricultural purpose.
A so-called pig shed is now a holiday let in the middle of a field in Barnby, adjacent to an under-construction "feed shed" (with large windows) which is big enough for a farm ten times the size of the field it is in. Will this be permitted as another change of use to holiday let in the future? The field also contains "stables" which have never been used as such. Sites such as this seem to be a vehicle for spreading holiday/residential use into areas where it would never have been permitted as an initial application.
Barnby Parish Council requests that the conversion of redundant buildings be limited to those that have actually been used for the purpose for some time.
Becky Taylor

Section Q43 a) Should we set out detailed criteria for establishing whether a new agricultural workers dwellings is needed? b) If so what should this criteria include?

Comment ID 1004

Comment I believe that rather than setting out detailed criteria, which have the potential of becoming rapidly out of date, the council should adopt broad principles under which its officers are able to make case-by-case decisions. Given the rich agricultural and horticultural traditions of the area, and the uncertainties produced by both volatile global food prices and climate change, the council should give sympathetic attention to initiatives based on low-impact and/or 'one planet development' principles as is currently the case in Wales. Where land-based projects/initiatives/planning proposals meet the majority of the following criteria their planning applications should be viewed sympathetically:

- are hyper-local in their focus;
- aim at supporting, developing or sustaining a resilient local economy;
- engage in organic/low carbon horticultural/agricultural production or forestry;
- are sustainable in their methods;
- promote biodiversity;
- support traditional rural skills;
- aim at providing part-time or full time employment for local people.
**Broads Authority Natalie Beal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q43 a) Should we set out detailed criteria for establishing whether a new agricultural workers dwellings is needed? b) If so what should this criteria include?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The Broads Authority intends to bring in some parts of the PPS7 into policy as there are some improvements needed to our current policy (DP26). Please go to this webpage near to 27 May to see the draft topic paper. <a href="http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/broads-authority/committees/planning-committee/planning-committee-27-may-2016">http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/broads-authority/committees/planning-committee/planning-committee-27-may-2016</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Councillor Norman Brooks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q43 a) Should we set out detailed criteria for establishing whether a new agricultural workers dwellings is needed? b) If so what should this criteria include?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q43 a) Should we set out detailed criteria for establishing whether a new agricultural workers dwellings is needed? b) If so what should this criteria include?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>a) yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) evidence of an ongoing requirement (i.e. not just seasonal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Bumpus

Section Q43 a) Should we set out detailed criteria for establishing whether a new agricultural workers dwellings is needed? b) If so what should this criteria include?

Comment ID 598

Comment There should be detailed criteria for any new agricultural dwelling. Criteria could include
* Area of freehold land in ownership. Leased land not counting.
* Actual presence of house dweller is needed on site for 24/7 eg the welfare of substantial numbers of housed livestock.
* Security of holding alone is insufficient to justify a dwelling.
* For new businesses there must be evidence of three years profitable operation before any consent to build is granted.
* Temporary planning consents should not be granted for dwellings. New businesses needing a dwelling should have mobile home type accommodation until profitability has been demonstrated.
* Assessing qualifying profitability is difficult, but some calculation based on the living wage for those engaged in the business would seem the minimum. Given the volatility of agriculture it might be appropriate to build in large safety margin!
Nicky Elliott

Section | Q43 a) Should we set out detailed criteria for establishing whether a new agricultural workers dwellings is needed? b) If so what should this criteria include?

Comment ID | 738

Comment | Yes. Organic agriculture requires many workers.
john norris

Section
Q43 a) Should we set out detailed criteria for establishing whether a new agricultural workers dwellings is needed? b) If so what should this criteria include?

Comment ID
848

Comment
no
Q44 a) Should we continue to restricts the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

**Section**

Q44 a) Should we continue to restricts the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

**Comment ID**

2025

**Comment**

No – I really can’t see any point in this – The "stock" of smaller dwellings in the countryside is already unaffordable for local needs so this policy really serves no useful purpose.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section  Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

Comment ID  1834

Comment  No allow small scale local development of starter style homes
### Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

**Section**

Q44 a) Should we continue to restricts the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

**Comment ID**

1730

**Comment**

- a) yes
- b) unknown
John Trew

Section  
Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

Comment ID  
25

Comment  
Extension restrictions are a must. You don't want affordable/starter homes extended so residents stay put.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

Comment ID 681

Comment a) Yes
**Nicky Elliott**

**Section**

Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

**Comment ID**

739

**Comment**

a) yes.

b) new dwellings should all be of restricted size.
Norman Castleton

Section  Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

Comment ID  441

Comment  Continue restrictions and allow smaller constructions as above
Section Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

Comment ID 1675

Comment Yes
Section Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

Comment ID 1267

Comment Extensions should be restricted as once a house has been made bigger it's then sold and becomes a second/holiday home, of which we have too many and deprives a single person/small family of an otherwise affordable home
**Paul Douch**

**Section**    Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

**Comment ID** 858

**Comment** a) Yes, I fear that restrictions are necessary
Section Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

Comment ID 849

Comment no
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert Gill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sally Minns & Associates Sally Minns

Section Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?

Comment ID 624

Comment No. In the light of the recent 2015 Blundeston appeal only homes which are affordable in the first place should be included in the policy. Also where new smaller homes are created these should be subject to the restrictive policy too so the stock of smaller cheaper homes remains and are not gentrified.
Wellington Construction Ltd  
Paul Pitcher  
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q44 a) Should we continue to restrict the size of extensions to dwellings and the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside? b) If not are there any other approaches which could conserve the stock of smaller properties in the countryside?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | No-design/amenity grounds offer sufficient control  
Flexible approach to rural housing – encourage smaller starter homes |
Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID 2026

Comment Q45-48 You need more flexible and pragmatic policy here – Protecting outdated employment buildings in the hope that they might eventually be reused is a nonsense. The new pd rights to convert office to houses and other premises to schools has largely undermined these sort of blanket protection policies. These policies should be more criteria based and less absolute.
Beccles Society Paul Fletcher

Section  Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID  1403

Comment  The Enterprise Zone should be continued in order to maintain wealth creation companies.
### Councillor Norman Brooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>If no demand for commercial use why not use for alternative case by case decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section  Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/ conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID  197

Comment  Yes
Environment Agency

Section  
Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID 2106

Comment  
It is worth noting that prior approval of light industrial units to flats through change of use, means that the development would not have to go through the sequential test process for flood risk and we would not be able to comment on this even if the location is within a high flood zone risk area. You may like to consider this to strengthen your case to retain employment areas and potentially include policy around this to prevent residential conversions from employment areas in areas of high flood risk.
**Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls**

**Section**
Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

**Comment ID**
1352

**Comment**
Existing and allocated employment areas should continue to be protected, and such a policy of protection should be a strategic policy, that Neighbourhood Plans would have to be in conformity with.
**Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julian Munson

Section Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID 1165

Comment Agree that existing employment areas should be protected from conversion to other uses but there needs to be greater effort in unlocking employment sites and bringing them forward with more proactive marketing and incentives to encourage businesses to relocate and expand. There should also be greater investment in broadband and more innovative approaches such as establishing business incubators/coworking spaces (for example) to support start-ups and home based businesses enabling them to access services and support locally (rather than having to go larger urban centres).
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section  Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID  1845

Comment  Kessingland is not currently included in the "Existing Employment Areas" as defined in the current Waveney Local Plan.

One of the main objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework is to build a strong competitive economy, in rural areas the aim is to support a prosperous economy, and in that regard Neighbourhood Plans should

* Support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings
* Promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land based rural businesses
* Support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, which respect the character of the countryside.
* Promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.

The community of Kessingland – both residents and existing businesses considers that the first and last of these objectives are the most important. Equally though, there is an important balance that the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to achieve.

It wishes to encourage the growth of appropriate commercial activities which create jobs for local people. This will be achieved by protecting existing commercial premises from change of use where the existing businesses are of demonstrable benefit to the community (i.e they create jobs which are capable of being accessed by the local workforce and/or they provide day-to-day services which are required by the local community. Kessingland has a small business base and it is important that this is protected.

The former Ashley Nurseries site (SA1) is expected will provide a small amount of Class B1 commercial employment floor space. This floor space should be targeted at providing incubator floor space that gives opportunities for small start-up businesses to take space and grow their
businesses. The draft policies BE1 and BE2 set out in detail how Kessingland should protect its existing commercial business premises and land which will strengthen the future economy and growth, creating jobs and providing the opportunity for new businesses to expand.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID 682

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Employment must remain the absolute priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Continue to identify employment areas and provide protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

Section Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID 1198

Comment Housing on employment sites will just lead to more unemployment ghettos
Pamela Cyprien

Section Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID 1268

Comment Yes
Section Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID 850

Comment yes
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section
Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Comment ID 1428

Comment
5. Other Development to Support Employment
We believe more consideration should be given in the Local Plan to the promotion of higher value employment locally, such as IT/design, in order to extend the range of employment available locally and strengthen the balance and sustainability of the community. This would not require major encroachment into the countryside but small-scale development/re-use, such as completing Reydon Business Park, redesignating Southwold Hospital or establishing mixed use of sites such as that of the former temporary Reydon Pharmacy.

In general we favour mixed uses of land in the area so that small-scale business can be developed alongside housing. In our view rigid zoning is undesirable because it tends to prevent the organic development of a community which has been the essence of Southwold and Reydon.
**Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor**

**Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?**

**Comment ID**

1946

**Comment**

We support existing employment areas, and their protection. In Southwold, there is an industrial/warehouse/workshop area located off St Edmunds Road. This should be designated and protected.

However, existing employment areas are not the only or necessarily the best way to promote economic development in the market towns of Waveney. Because of its built heritage, the Suffolk Coast, and AONBs, Waveney has the opportunity to grow knowledge sector businesses which prefer to be based in town centres and located in recycled buildings such as former schools, hospitals, 19th and early 20th century industrial buildings. Knowledge based businesses like to congregate together because they are not competitive in the traditional sense; they thrive on each other’s networks and creativity. These businesses are often start-ups, perhaps one person initially or micro and small businesses. To reduce risk, and because of new ways of working, they require flexible, low cost work space, shared resources such as reception areas and conference rooms. If successful, they need to be able to find local space to grow into.

Southwold has one of the country’s highest percentages of jobs directly related to tourism – 57%. Infrastructure is a recurring theme throughout this consultation response. We are trying to encourage the diversification of Southwold’s economy away from its over-dependence on tourism. The seasonality of tourism, and the needs of tourists, undermine the provision of services and goods for the ordinary needs of full time residents. This creates a hardship on full time residents and makes the town a less attractive place for people to live and work.

For a town to be a good place to visit, it also has to be a good place to live and work.

We urge you to incorporate into the Local Plan the economic development policies of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, adopted in March 2015 by Camden Council in London. https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=3362262&. Specifically, see its policies on...
business and commercial centres in Section F, and its support for affordable business and retail space.

We also urge you to encourage Business Innovation Centres in Market Towns – see https://www.google.co.uk/?gws_rd=ssl#q=oxford+innovations+research+findings+2003++2013

In addition, the Local Plan economic development strategy should be flexible enough to enable Neighbourhood Plans to develop specific sites and policies that promote knowledge based businesses and other economic development outcomes identified by local communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St John’s Hall Farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bidwells (John Long)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section**

Q45 Should we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' and protect premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

**Comment ID**

1390

**Comment**

St John’s Hall Farms agree that the Local Plan should still identify employment areas for employment use for a period of time (3 years) but include provisions for alternative uses should employment uses not be delivered with the timescales, if evidence demonstrates there is no viable demand for employment use. This provision should also be applied to allocated employment areas. Such an approach would reflect the provisions in the Government’s proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework.
**Q46 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas', which areas should be identified?**

**BKW Ltd**  
**Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q46 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas', which areas should be identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**  
Evolution Town Planning made representations on behalf of the landowners BKW Ltd at the call for sites stage for land at Ellough Airfield. We submitted details of 9ha of available land at Ellough for employment uses. Those representations included reference to the constructed anaerobic digestion plant and the extant planning permission for the commercial grain store; both employment uses.  
The Waveney Core Strategy's vision for Beccles states that "Beccles Business Park at Ellough will offer additional opportunities for local employment ". It goes on to say that "There is demand for more land in the area of Ellough/Beccles Business Park to accommodate the needs of larger users for B1, B2 and B8 use [...] Progress in developing the undeveloped areas of land at Ellough will be an important consideration in determining the need to allocate further land here". When the Core Strategy was adopted this site was an 'undeveloped area of land' at Ellough but this is no longer the case. Recent industrial scale planning permissions have opened up the potential of this site to, potentially, the 'larger users' the Core Strategy referred to.  
The 9ha site is located in the centre of the former Ellough Airfield, to the east of Copland Way. A revised plan of the site is included with these representations (to clarify that we understand the County Wildlife Site is not to be developed) along with the Council's completed Call for Sites proforma. The site is 16.3ha in size and is well related to the wider industrial estate and local transport network. The site has a significant frontage onto Copland Way and the B1127. The site includes a consented anaerobic digestion plant which has seen subsequent planning permissions for a storage lagoon and National Grid connection compound. Construction is well underway on the anaerobic digestion plant and is nearing completion on all elements. There is also an extant planning permission for
a large scale commercial grain store and a temporary planning permission for aggregate storage on the former runway to the east. These areas of these planning permissions total some 6.7ha. There is therefore 9ha remaining undeveloped currently.

Land at Ellough has been allocated for employment uses since the LDF and is referred to as BEC1. This land benefits from enterprise zone status but has not been development in that plan period. It will be for the local planning authority to consider the implications of paragraph 22 of the NPPF which states that “Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.” In any event the BEC1 land has been submitted to the new local plan by the landowners for residential development with the employment allocation relocated to our clients land.

We would support the existing employment use and extant planning permission on our site being recognised as an existing employment site and the remaining 9ha of land being allocated for employment uses. This is because, unlike BEC1, development which aligns with the Core Strategy aims for Ellough has come forward on our client's land during the previous plan period and is reasonably likely to continue to do so during the next plan period. Particularly with the support of an allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q46 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas', which areas should be identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>At least as per the current list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lowestoft & Waveney Chamber of Commerce Linda Thornton

Section | Q46 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas', which areas should be identified?

Comment ID | 2236

Comment | Our understanding is that there is currently a significant over allocation of employment land in the District which is not helpful to overall development. We would therefore support a reduction in the allocation of employment land and at the same time urge the Council to be mindful of the new opportunities that will arise in both north and south Lowestoft following the opening of the new crossing over Lake Lothing; in that context we especially support the potential development area south of Lowestoft identified on page 44 of the consultation document.
Norfolk County Council Laura Waters

Section Q46 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas', which areas should be identified?

Comment ID 1495

Comment Those identified in the current plan unless circumstances have changed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norman Castleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.

Councillor Norman Brooks

Section

Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.

Comment ID

1838

Comment

Yes they could command increased rates in the future and they are normally kept tidy and demonstrate an active area.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.

Comment ID 2161

Comment There is an unusual concentration of car dealerships on central sites in the town which cover large areas with stationary vehicles to no general benefit and tend to involve on-street loading which is both disruptive and potentially hazardous. This business should be encouraged to relocate to more suitable sites in the employment zone further north which would release the town centre sites for residential and amenity / retail use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julian Munson

Section Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.

Comment ID 1171

Comment Depends on type and location of employment area. For example if a new higher quality office/business park is being established, other uses such as tyre and exhaust centres, building material stores etc may affect the overall image and identify of the site and make it harder to attract occupiers.
John Eade

Section

Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.

Comment ID

529

Comment

Yes. These activities give rise to employment and help to maintain the infrastructure required for increased employment.
Anne McClarnon

Section: Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.

Comment ID: 683

Comment: Fine
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Suggest adopting a flexible approach if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Definitely not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>john norris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.

Comment ID: 1009

Comment: Perplexed! Surely these are employing people thus employment areas. Don't make the mistake again of erecting office blocks and units that no one occupys eg. Where Dunelm now is (what a waste of money.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q47 If we continue to identify 'Existing Employment Areas' should we also continue to allow uses such as car showrooms, tire and exhaust centres and building material stores to be located on the main road frontages of existing employment areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>St John's Hall Farms suggest that the Council should allow car showrooms to be located on road frontages of employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q48 Should the protection of existing employment premises be in a Strategic Policy, requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section  Q48 Should the protection of existing employment premises be in a Strategic Policy, requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID  1116

Comment  Yes
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section  Q48 Should the protection of existing employment premises be in a Strategic Policy, requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID  1353

Comment  Existing and allocated employment areas should continue to be protected, and such a policy of protection should be a strategic policy, that Neighbourhood Plans would have to be in conformity with.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q48 Should the protection of existing employment premises be in a Strategic Policy, requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julian Munson

Section Q48 Should the protection of existing employment premises be in a Strategic Policy, requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID 1166

Comment Yes existing employment premises should be protected particularly in the market towns to ensure that local employment opportunities are retained and supported. Market town high streets might require a specific policy to protect for future generations with a mix of both employment and some residential to ensure their on-going viability and provision of local services and retail/leisure options.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q48 Should the protection of existing employment premises be in a Strategic Policy, requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID 684

Comment Yes
Norfolk County Council Laura Waters

Section  Q48 Should the protection of existing employment premises be in a Strategic Policy, requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID  1497

Comment  Yes
Section Q48 Should the protection of existing employment premises be in a Strategic Policy, requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID 448

Comment Yes
Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID 2027

Comment Allocate sufficient and be flexible around the edges as required. Not every employment use will or can go to a dedicate industrial park.
BKW Ltd
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID 2121

Comment The local planning authority will need to be cautious of the long term protection of employment land if more employment land is allocated than needed. But this will need to be balanced with the economic benefits that are anticipated through the opening of the Beccles relief road which should not be stifled. Therefore at Ellough it will be necessary to allow for future growth by allocating sites which demonstrate a real prospect of being developed rather than sit undeveloped as an allocation for the plan period. A good example of this is the land we are promoting. Because it is already part developed the remainder of the site should be allocated because the owners have demonstrated their willingness to develop the land. The site is unlikely to fall foul of 'long term protection' issues because housing development on the remaining 9ha site is unlikely to be suitable because of the close proximity to the existing anaerobic digestion site and the extant planning permission for the commercial grain store.
brian may

Section

Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID

274

Comment

Second option seems best. Allocate land on basis of what definitely known but be prepared to be flexible about areas should a demand appear. The ELNA is based on guesstimates of future growth. It accepts that there are many unknown variables so some flexibility is needed. The biggest problem the ELNA suggests is employment land to the north of Lowestoft otherwise business may relocate to Great Yarmouth. The Government & Council can plan as much as they want but the problem is they are not investing the money to build, buy or rent these properties so there has to be a bit of going with the flow of what the market requires. This obviously needs to be tempered with considerations of how a development would sit with the existing community.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID 1118

Comment b) The Council should allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where new development is supported, outside allocated areas, if additional need is proven.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Councillor Norman Brooks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID 1354

Comment The second option is recommended – to allocate sufficient land and have a flexible approach to other schemes coming forward. This is because there is a danger that over-allocating employment land could result in pressure to convert some of this to residential land if it did not come forward within a few years – and some such sites may be inappropriate for residential use.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID 1735

Comment enough land to meet the need with a flexible approach
McGregor

Section

Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID
1012

Comment
The area has under employment as you have mentioned so where are these jobs coming from that you might need to over compensate? It seems a dream that this area will become successful industrial.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID 685

Comment A flexible approach seems sensible.
Norfolk County Council Laura Waters

Section Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID 1498

Comment Allocating more than enough land to meet needs would seem to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances, particularly if the Oil and Gas industry recovers swiftly from the current downturn and the renewable market takes off.
Norman Castleton

Section Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID 444

Comment The second option with the Council allocating only enough land
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID 65

Comment Allocate based on need but apply a flexible approach if to the benefit of the wider community.
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section  Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID  2079

Comment  We believe more consideration should be given in the Local Plan to the promotion of higher value employment locally, such as IT/design. This would not require major encroachment into the countryside but small-scale development/re-use, such as completing Reydon Business Park, redesignating Southwold Hospital or establishing mixed use of sites such as that of the former temporary Reydon Pharmacy.
Southwold & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce Guy Mitchell

Section Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

Comment ID 1663

Comment Economic Mix
The economy of Southwold & Reydon is largely dependent upon leisure and tourism. Although Adnams makes a significant contribution to the economy and is the major single employer it also has an interest in tourism through pubs, restaurants and "beer from the coast". Whilst the Reydon Business Park provides opportunities for a variety of different businesses, space here is limited as is the transport infrastructure. There is, therefore little economic diversity
Tourism is a real strength for the area and should continue to be developed and promoted, however, diversification from tourism should also be encouraged to attract a greater range of options for employment. In particular, consideration should be given to promoting small scale service based business. Smaller businesses working in IT, Design, Marketing, Communications, Financial Services or a range of consultancy businesses should be encouraged. Developing a network of peers and symbiotic relationships could make Southwold and Reydon attractive places for entrepreneurs to locate their fledgling businesses – but only if premises are available. Opportunities to develop small, flexible, service based premises should therefore be encouraged.
Reference should be made to the recent report by the Centre for Entrepreneurs – "From ebb to flow: how entrepreneurs can turn the tide for seaside towns"
http://centreforentrepreneurs.org/cfe-research/from-ebb-to-flow-how-entrepreneurs-can-turn-the-tide-for-seaside-towns/
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

**Section**
Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n

**Comment ID**
1947

**Comment**
The approach to allocating land for business should be flexible and Waveney should be considering the economy of the future in its economic development land use policies. Because space is so expensive in London, companies are encouraging employees to work long distance, but many employees do not have sufficient space to work from home. For this group, shared office space (co-working) could offer a solution, but not if the shared space is in a segregated office park like the Reydon Business park. (Live-work units did not succeed there because of its location and design.) Mixed residential and business (office) is appropriate but the key to its viability (attractiveness) is proximity to the town centre.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q49 Should we allocate more than enough land to meet needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to deal with changing circumstances. Or, should the Council allocate only enough land to meet needs, but apply a flexible approach, where n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher**
**MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)**
Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?

Comment ID 2028

Comment We have looked at the viability of this following a proposal in the Neighbourhood Plan to make this sort of allocation on the former nurseries site in Kessingland and we cannot make the sums add up. Unless there is a lot of space to keep the uses separate then there are compatibility problems and spreading things out destroys land value. Presently the difference between capital value and construction cost on small units is such that they are very difficult to fund.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?

Comment ID 1841

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Cross-subsidising employment land with some market housing is supported – but there would need to be safeguards to ensure that the employment land actually comes forward at the same time as the housing element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julian Munson

Section Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?

Comment ID 1167

Comment If this is an option which will help unlock employment sites then yes mixed use development is worth considering (but requires careful consideration and planning and needs to be appropriate to local needs)
John Eade

Section  Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?

Comment ID  530

Comment  Unless the housing relates to employment being developed this approach will only serve to increase housing and population in excess of employment opportunities and so it would be a mistake.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment ID** 1499

**Comment** Yes this will incentivise land owners to retain an employment element
Norman Castleton

Section Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?

Comment ID 445

Comment The two should not be mixed or reliant on each other in any way.
Norman Castleton

Section Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?

Comment ID 450

Comment No mixed use developments
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?

Comment ID 66

Comment Employment land should stand on its own feet and not be subsidised by homebuyers.
John Norris

Section

Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?

Comment ID 852

Comment yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section Q50 In order to address viability issues, should we allocate sites for mixed-use housing and employment developments where the housing development subsidises the delivery of employment land?

Comment ID 1454

Comment Yes
Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Bourne Leisure Ltd (Lichfields)
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Miss Heslop)

Section

Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID

2168

Comment

Bourne Leisure recognises the importance and value of Waveney’s natural environment and landscape. The Company considers that policies for the natural environment should include reference to balance, and the consideration of the social and economic benefits potentially arising from the enhancement (and where appropriate, the extension) of existing tourism developments. Accordingly, future decisions should take full account of the specific characteristics of each development proposal in any location and assess whether it makes a positive contribution to protecting or enhancing the environment, when considered on a case by case basis. It is therefore considered that the importance of balancing environmental concerns with the economic and social benefits of development should be a key approach and policy theme throughout the emerging Local Plan. In particular, the emerging Plan should support new, appropriately designed developments in sensitive locations, with proportionate mitigation where required – such developments including the enhancement and expansion of holiday resorts/ villages/ parks, for which a countryside/coastal location is essential.

In addition to positively promoting additional visitor accommodation as a matter of principle, the emerging Local Plan should take into account opportunities for the improvement and expansion of existing holiday villages and parks, such as Corton and Gunton Hall coastal villages, and acknowledge the invaluable role that existing tourism accommodation and
facilities currently play – and should continue to play - within the Borough. Bourne Leisure strongly considers that in-principle policy support should be provided for the upgrading and extension of existing holiday villages, resorts and parks in order to provide additional visitor accommodation to support and contribute to the future development of the tourism section within Waveney. In addition, Bourne Leisure considers that recognition should be given to facilitating the ongoing requirement for operators to continuously upgrade and carry out improvements to tourism facilities such as holiday resorts, villages and parks, so as to meet visitors’ expectations. The emerging Local Plan should recognise that such improvements may require some expansion of site area, e.g. in order to provide enhanced landscaping as an integral part of an expanded operation.
Bourne Leisure Ltd (Lichfields)
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Miss Heslop)

Section  Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID  2169

Comment  Landscape
General Comments
As noted within the response to question 51, Bourne Leisure would wish to iterate the point that emerging development management policies in relation to the landscape should include reference to the need to balance the consideration of the social and economic benefits potentially arising from the enhancement of existing tourism developments. Recognition should be given in the emerging Plan to the scope for appropriate tourism development, including the expansion of existing holiday accommodation, in areas within or adjacent to sensitive landscape sites and designated nature conservation sites, provided that commensurate mitigation measures, such as the inclusion of a buffer zone and appropriate landscaping, can be implemented in order to minimise both direct and indirect impacts.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID 1123

Comment It should take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape. However housing development can also impact on the landscape and should be restricted too in areas bordering areas of outstanding beauty and wild life.

Eg in Carlton Colville any increase in housing development along Beccles Road would impinge on the Carlton Marshes and on the viability of wild life there because the closeness of a housing development to the marshes might lead to the marshes being overused as a substitute for a recreational park and this would be detrimental to wild life there.
**Councillor Norman Brooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Flexible approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID 198

Comment Continue to restrict
Gill Armstrong

Section

Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID

1232

Comment

Absolutely, otherwise the whole area will be built on and there will be nothing of interest for tourists to visit. It is very short sighted to use all our available space for development.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section  Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID  1737

Comment  yes
Julian Munson

Section Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID 1170

Comment Development in these areas should be restricted so to protect and preserve the natural environment (which is our biggest asset). Bed and breakfast and self catering in existing houses acceptable. Possible conversion of existing stately homes/larger country residences for tourism/hotel accommodation is acceptable. There is scope for greater focus on accommodation more inland and in the market towns and Waveney Valley.
IESLEY BEEVOR

Section Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID 785

Comment continue to restrict
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McGregor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne McClarnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID 451

Comment Tourist development should be restricted as now.
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes restrict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Cyprien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pat Took

Section Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID 815

Comment Tourists come to our area because it is relatively unspoilt - they will not want to see more new housing estates or hotels. Conversion of existing buildings to tourist accommodation would cater for tourists whilst not spoiling the scenic value of our towns, villages and countryside.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>john norris</td>
<td>Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment ID: 972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?

Comment ID 1948

Comment We strongly urge that new tourism attractions should be restricted in the AONB and on the Heritage Coast. Further tourism development should not be permitted in Southwold. It is not sustainable. In our view, the title on P. 27 should be changed to Hotels, Guest Houses and Holiday Lets in residential streets. The experience in Southwold is that properties which have been converted to holiday lets generate more parking and more waste, and the transient users, who often do not have a sense of responsibility to the community or to the upkeep of the town, are overwhelmingly users of services. Some even order their groceries on line. Over a fifth of Southwold's dwellings are advertised as holiday lets. (This under-estimates the number because some people manage their own holiday lets.) It is easy to identify which homes are being used as holiday lets and for how many weeks in the year; this information is available on agents' websites and publications. Holiday lets should be treated as businesses and a change of use from residential to business should be required as soon as possible. Planning permission for any development of a holiday let should be refused unless adequate off-site parking (based on SCC guidelines 2015) is provided. They should be required to pay for trade waste and should pay business rates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Terry McDonald</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher  
| ---  
| MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)  
|  
| **Section** | Q51 Should we continue to restrict the development of new tourist accommodation in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast or should it take a more flexible approach based on impact on the landscape?  
| **Comment ID** | 1455  
| **Comment** | More flexible approach reqd – benefit for local economy |
Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Barnby Parish Council Ian Hinton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Equine Tourism  
There appears to be an increasing number of applications for the creation of paddocks carved out of fields, with attached houses, for the purposes of equine tourism in the area. The local concern is that one permission on a narrow lane will set a precedent for further applications which become increasingly difficult to refuse.  
If an application is made for an exception to the Local plan for housing in an area outside village envelopes for a dwelling for an essential agricultural worker, it has to be accompanied by a business plan demonstrating the need for the exception, and close restrictions on the use are placed on the subsequent permission and any future changes that may be applied for.  
Barnby Parish Council feels strongly that a similar accredited business case should have to accompany any application for equine tourism, with an explanation of why the site is suitable.  
Despite the increase in applications, the area is not really suitable for equine tourism as there are almost no bridle paths in this area and many footpaths are used as bridle paths to their detriment. The lanes in the area are extremely narrow, often not wide enough for two cars to pass without passing places. These roads do not suit large horse boxes/trailers, nor are they suitable for inexperienced riders who do not know the area.  
It must be made plain to applicants that this will never be a route to achieving full residential use if the equine rental business fails, and that they can only be sold with the same restrictive rights.  
As a parallel consideration, if this use is permitted then the type of dwelling permitted should not be a typical three/four-bedroom chalet bungalow, |
thus lending itself to later residential use, but rather a building similar to a 
log cabin - fine for holiday rentals, but less attractive for full residential use. 
Barnby Parish Council suggests that the requirement for an accredited 
business case for such applications be added to the Local Plan.
Beccles Town Council C Boyne

Section  
Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID  
1490

Comment  
The working party felt that a new hotel on the site at the junction of the Beccles by pass A146 and George Westwood Way (opposite Morrisons) would be of enormous benefit to the town and bring a considerable increase in tourism and subsequent revenue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>take a more flexible approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Norman Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Flexible approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section  Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID  199

Comment  Take a more flexible approach BUT CARE NEEDED
### Environment Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>There are a number of close links and associations that can be made between the benefits that a good environment can bring to the area and tourism. We would like to work with you to encourage environmental enhancements that would promote further tourism into the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gill Armstrong

Section Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID 1233

Comment I do not think we should continue to focus new tourist development on Corton and Kessingland. Corton is already overcrowded with tourist development, it is unfair to continue to increase this to the detriment of the area as a residential village. The whole of the Corton shoreline is taken up by holiday accommodation leaving only two limited access points for the residents of the village, both of which are closed during the winter.
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section

Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID

1356

Comment

Having the main focus for new tourism development on the main settlements and the coast is appropriate, but some more flexibility on new tourism accommodation in the Waveney valley could be helpful. Both Waveney DC and South Norfolk Council are setting up Local Tourism Action Groups for the Waveney valley, and are working closely together to market the valley as a single entity for tourism purposes.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID 1738

Comment continue with current focus
Julian Munson

Section  Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID  1169

Comment  Agree that tourist development should be focused in these locations but there should be an even stronger focus on supporting the market towns which are located more inland i.e. Halesworth, Bungay and Beccles. Opportunities to work across neighbouring districts and market towns should be supported e.g. within the Waveney Valley, to help attract visitors from the coastal areas which are often overcrowded in the summer season. There could be an even greater focus on arts, culture, local food and drink in helping to define a higher quality, local 'tourism product'.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID 1885

Comment Being located on the coast, tourism is an important part of the economy of Kessingland. A significant number of properties along and close to the seafront are used for tourist accommodation. Many of these tourist properties are retained as such due to planning conditions placed on their use, meaning that they cannot be occupied by the same tenant for a full 12 month period, often restricting this to a maximum of eight months. This prevents properties from being used as permanent residences. Over recent years there have been planning applications seeking to vary these conditions so that these properties can be used as permanent residences. Once these properties are lost to the tourist sector they are not replaced, neither is the loss of direct and indirect income from the people who stay in them.

It is therefore important that the tourist properties in Kessingland – which are located close to or on the seafront are protected as tourist properties and do not have their status changed to permanent residences. If such a change is to occur, then it must be clearly demonstrated that the continued use of the property as a tourist property is no longer viable. This must be achieved through a clear and detailed marketing campaign for tourist occupancy, using recognised sources for advertising properties or through a suitable accommodation website. This campaign must be undertaken for at least a period of 12 months.
**lesley beevor**

**Section**  
Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

**Comment ID**  
786

**Comment**  
consider each on merit
Anne McClarnon

Section Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID 688

Comment Place them near to where people live: we need the jobs where the population are. If we do want to use the countryside, then transport considerations must come into the decision-making process.
Norman Castleton

Section

Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID 454

Comment Continue as now
john norris

Section Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID 973

Comment yes
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q52 Should we continue to focus new tourist development in or close to Lowestoft, the Market Towns and Corton and Kessingland or should we take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID 1094

Comment Be more flexible, I think site 145 would suite being a camp style site as it's close to town and people like to cycle, close to country side, good cycle rides into Ringsfield and villages. Also it would offer an alternative to the marina side of town and balance the options.
Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?

Bourne Leisure Ltd (Lichfields)
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Miss Heslop)

Section  Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?

Comment ID  2170

Comment  Bourne Leisure strongly supports the recognition in principle of the need to protect existing tourist accommodation within Waveney from conversion and redevelopment. The emerging Local Plan should recognise the importance of maintaining and enhancing the existing tourism accommodation base within the District and specifically acknowledge the importance of holiday resorts/villages/parks in providing visitors with accommodation choices. It is of strategic importance that existing tourist accommodation is supported for retention and enhancement, in order to continue to support and contribute increasingly to the tourism sector within Waveney.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section  Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?

Comment ID  1125

Comment  yes
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section  Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?

Comment ID  1844

Comment  Flexible approach
CTC John Thompson

**Section**

Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?

**Comment ID**

201

**Comment**

Not sure this is a clear-cut issue. I will say protect it as far as possible, but there may be all sorts of circumstances to consider, not least economic/viability ones.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McGregor

Section  Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?

Comment ID  1011

Comment  Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Norman Castleton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes, continue as now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
john norris

Section  

Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?

Comment ID  

974

Comment  

yes
The Caravan Club Limited Sue McElliott

Section Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?

Comment ID 1470

Comment This letter contains our representation to the Issues and Options Consultation of the emerging Waveney Local Plan on behalf of The Caravan Club. This representation relates specifically to the section headed 'Tourism'.

The Site
The White House Beach Caravan Club Site is located approximately 4 km south of Lowestoft, on the south-eastern edge of the settlement of Kessingland on the B1437. The site has an area of approximately 3.1ha and has a total of 112 pitches, of which 80 are hardstanding. The site includes internal tarmac roads, a reception, information room, three toilet blocks, a laundry facility, a small car parking area, and permanent accommodation for the site Warden and Assistant Warden. Given the amount of hardstanding, the site could be considered to be previously developed. The eastern portion of the site is bounded by a wooden fence of approximately 1.5 metres in height which affords holidaymakers views of the beach and the sea. The eastern boundary of the site lies adjacent to the Pakefield to Easton Bavents SSSI.

The site is approximately 750 metres away from a bus stop, from which services run to Kessingland, Pakefield, Lowestoft, Yarmouth and Norwich. The nearest train stations are located to the north, with Oulton Broad South station located approximately 6.5km away and Lowestoft station located approximately 7km away, both of which can be accessed by bus. These stations provide services to Beccles, Halesworth, Norwich, and Ipswich.

Local Plan Issues and Options
The Issues and Options consultation on the emerging Local Plan seeks to determine whether the existing policies on tourism should be maintained or modified, particularly when it comes to new or existing tourist accommodation. This emerging Local Plan recognises of the importance of the tourism sector to the Waveney economy, and also acknowledges how both the East Suffolk Business Plan and the Suffolk Coast Tourism Strategy promote the increase of tourism and visitors to the area.

The Issues and Options Document identifies that New Tourism Accommodation is currently restricted in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coastline and is focused towards areas in or close to
settlements in Kessingland. This approach is supported by the Caravan Club however this should include the diversification of existing sites into new forms of tourist accommodation.

The Caravan Club support the approach that has been taken by Waveney District Council in the current Core Strategy through Policy CS13- Tourism where the redevelopment of existing sites will be encouraged where it increases the range of accommodation available, and in the Development Management Policy DM24 Touring Caravan, Camping and Permanent Holiday Sites, which supports the provision of a variety of types of accommodation types and sizes.

The Caravan Club wish to see these policies continued and would welcome continued guidance being set out in respect to diversifying accommodation on existing touring caravan sites.

The Caravan Club may wish in the future to diversify the accommodation provided at White House Beach by adding Lodges or Camping Pods on the site, for tourism purposes only whilst also retaining touring caravan use. These are generally small scale, permanent or semi permanent structures, typically of timber construction containing a bedroom and depending on size also providing cooking facilities and/or bathroom facilities. The Caravan Club may wish to provide this type of accommodation to ensure that they can continue to meet the changing needs of their members and the visitor economy as a whole.

This form of diversification on the site would not have a negative impact on the surrounding area. Given the small scale nature of this type of tourism accommodation and the existing screening on the site there would be no negative impact on surrounding properties or the local environment. The site is in a sustainable location with good access to the public transport network, which would ensure the sustainability of the site. The diversification of this site would have no additional impact when compared to the existing use of the site.

Flexibility is key for the Caravan Club to ensure that their site remains economically viable and can continue to support the local economy, local employment, and the tourism industry. The Caravan Club must ensure that it can adapt its sites so that they continue to appeal to members and can accommodate a range of visitors. Tourism policies must be sufficiently flexible to allow businesses to adapt to changing economic trends and changes in the demands of tourists, and we wish to ensure that under these policies that the potential diversification of this site would be permitted.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section Q53 Should we continue to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?

Comment ID 1456

Comment No-Royal Court Hotel in London Rd South Lowestoft Classic example of inertia through inflexible policy but a policy demonstrating unviability and lack of market interest would help to unlock such sites
Q54 How should tourism accommodation be effectively restricted for tourism use and not full time residential use?

Bourne Leisure Ltd (Lichfields)
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Miss Heslop)

Section

Q54 How should tourism accommodation be effectively restricted for tourism use and not full time residential use?

Comment ID

2171

Comment

Bourne Leisure considers that for tourism accommodation provided in caravans, chalets or similar, a Local Plan policy should be introduced to ensure that any planning permission for such accommodation is restricted to holiday use only. Where necessary, local plan policy should state that conditions are to be imposed on planning permissions to ensure that tourism accommodation cannot be used for residential purposes.
### Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

**Section**  
Q54 How should tourism accommodation be effectively restricted for tourism use and not full time residential use?

**Comment ID**  
1126

**Comment**  
protect it as above
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section Q54 How should tourism accommodation be effectively restricted for tourism use and not full time residential use?

Comment ID 202

Comment I would assume there is legal means
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q54 How should tourism accommodation be effectively restricted for tourism use and not full time residential use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>limit the period of occupancy in the same way that mobile homes / caravans are limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section Q54 How should tourism accommodation be effectively restricted for tourism use and not full time residential use?

Comment ID 690

Comment There should be clear planning criteria and legally binding agreements before tourist developers/owners are allowed to build or purchase such accommodation. There should be covenants (or whatever) which make it impossible for (particularly small) tourist accommodation to be converted to full-time residential use.
Norman Castleton

Section Q54 How should tourism accommodation be effectively restricted for tourism use and not full time residential use?

Comment ID 455

Comment Caravan sites should not be static full time use sites as prevails on the North Denes. Tourist accommodation should restricted for tourist use
Section Q54 How should tourism accommodation be effectively restricted for tourism use and not full time residential use?

Comment ID 975

Comment by limiting the time a tourist can reside there
Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?

**Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>take a more flexible approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?

Comment ID 1847

Comment Flexible approach
**Councillor Norman Brooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Needs further details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?

Comment ID 203

Comment a more flexible approach in accordance with what is explained
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>A more flexible approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section | Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?

Comment ID | 531

Comment | A more flexible approach would appear to be reasonable on a case by case basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Absolutely yes. Owners of such properties have little interest in the community, only profits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?

Comment ID 691

Comment A more flexible approach might be in order, if noise and transport/parking criteria are met.
Norman Castleton

Section  Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?

Comment ID  453

Comment  Continue as now
john norris

Section Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?

Comment ID 976

Comment yes
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q55 Should we continue to restrict the conversion of residential properties to guest houses and hotels in residential streets where further conversion to flats would also not be permitted, or should a more flexible approach to be used?

Comment ID 1949

Comment The logic of this policy, which relates to the use and user, parking and amenity problems, and the need to preserve a stock of a certain sized home (in the case of Southwold, homes attractive to families) should be extended to residences being converted to holiday lets. In Southwold, we have seen a stark decline in visitors using bed and breakfast, which have been supplanted by holiday lets. This is a new form of tourism accommodation.
Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?

Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Norman Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Needs further details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haycock

Section Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?

Comment ID 912

Comment Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?

Comment ID 456

Comment I agree with the boundaries as now
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosemary Simpson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce Guy Mitchell

Section Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?

Comment ID 1688

Comment Southwold Town Centre Boundary
The recent Carter Jonas Report confirms that "the centre's retail offer is focussed along the linear High Street and Market Place where it forks into East Street and Queen Street, joining together on Pinkey's Lane...the town centre boundary includes the length of the High Street, Market Place and sections of East Street and Queens Street. The boundary is very tightly drawn and does not include the entire length of East Street and Queens Street on which two public houses (Red Lion and Lord Nelson) are situated towards the sea front. The Adnams Wine Cellar and Kitchen Store (and instore café) located on Victoria Street is also not included within the boundary. Given that this is one of Southwold’s key attractions we nevertheless advise that it should be included within the defined PSA and Town Centre boundary".
Given the high occupancy rate within the town centre, it is apparent that demand has exceeded supply for a considerable amount of time. In view of this, we believe that the economy would benefit from an extension of the town centre boundary to include all existing commercial premises. These premises should be protected from being converted for residential use. The boundary should be re-drawn to include the following commercial premises:
The Red Lion and Lord Nelson pubs, High Tide (36 East Street), Acanthus (Trinity Street), Adnams Cellar & Kitchen and all properties between that and Fromus Vets on the High Street, John Bennett Architects Practice (corner of Spinners Lane), The Electric Picture Palace (Blackmill Rd), Spring Design & Advertising (Church Street), The Sole Bay Inn and Number One St James' Green (St James’ Green).
Southwold & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce Guy Mitchell

Section Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?

Comment ID 1689

Comment Southwold Town Centre
Mix of businesses
Carter Jonas note that Southwold's proportion of service retailers is the lowest for the District's market towns. This suggests that there could be potential to expand on this offer to ensure that the day-to-day needs of both residents and visitors are catered for. The plan will need to ensure that premises are available to meet this need.

Southwold has an unusually high proportion of independent businesses. In recent years this ratio has changed with the proportion of independent businesses becoming smaller over time. It is widely acknowledged that one of Southwold's strengths is its independent nature and the fact that it offers something different from the majority of Britain's high streets.

It should be noted that the Carter Jonas report is misleading in its interpretation of its survey regarding improvement to the Town Centre. Whilst it is encouraging that 65.62% of respondents viewed the town centre as attractive/nice place, the survey also suggests that 1.12% of respondents would like to see more independent shops. Carter Jonas, however chose to highlight the fact that just 0.77% would like to see more national chains and have interpreted this as "Respondents also identified a need for ...more national multiple shops/high street shops". The statistics clearly show that a greater number favour independent business. We are disappointed to see this bias in a report which should be objective in its outlook and are consequently unsure of its validity as a document which will influence planners.

In addition to the Carter Jonas Report, consideration should be given to the Southwold Town Plan of October 2013. This highlighted that 78% of Southwold residents and 87% of second homers thought the character of The High Street very important. When asked what attracted them to visit Southwold, 95% of visitors highlighted "character of town centre". Thus the character of Southwold's High Street is of overwhelming importance to the main contributors to the town's economy – visitors. This group has not been considered in the Carter Jonas survey.

The Carter Jonas report states that "experience shows that a new scheme that offers retailers and commercial leisure operators modern, well-
configured floor space adjacent to like-minded tenants in a prominent location will generally generate a significant uplift in market interest and demand”. This would suggest redevelopment of existing retails premises to meet the requirements of Carter Jonas’ key customers in the large corporate/commercial property market. The report fails to place sufficient emphasis of the value of the independent businesses which contribute so much to the character of the town and which is clearly valued highly by visitors and residents. Our understanding is that the Local Plan aims enhance the local community for residents and businesses rather than generate an uplift in market interest and demand where occupancy rates are already unusually high.

The Chamber of Trade would like to see opportunities for development restricted. Smaller premises are less attractive to large, national retailers both because of their total floor space and because of the difficulty in fitting stores out to national corporate templates. By retaining smaller premises in the mix, independent retailers will continue to be able to trade with sustainable and achievable levels of rent. If all premises are developed to meet the needs of national chains, the character of Southwold will be erased. Once inside a shop, customers will be in a homogenised environment which has no association with the town. It’s unique selling point will be lost. If this is the case, in the long term, its appeal to visitors will diminish, national retailers will withdraw and the vacancy rate will rise. Once the reputation of the town is lost it will be very hard to re-build. Every effort should be made to encourage and stimulate a vibrant and diverse town centre. It should be noted that the move of the health centre to Reydon and the closure of Southwold Hospital have both had an effect upon the local economy. Both the surgery and the hospital brought employees into the centre of the town and those employees used the town’s shops and services. In addition, users of their services also used the services of the town when visiting. For example, residents of Reydon attending the surgery for routine visits would also take the opportunity to visit the post office, pharmacy, or newsagents. Without the need to visit the centre of town, the likelihood of them conducting "the business of everyday life" in a large supermarket in Halesworth, Beccles or Lowestoft is greatly increased. A drop in numbers of people in the town leads to a lack of atmosphere – particularly noticeable in times outside of the tourism season. With a decline in numbers of residents this becomes increasingly noticeable. By focussing purely on housing needs there is a danger that the community will become dysfunctional.
Southwold & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce Guy Mitchell

Section Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?

Comment ID 1690

Comment Southwold Town Centre Out of town supermarket
It should be noted that the Southwold Town Plan sought opinions from residents and visitors regarding the development of supermarket on the outskirts of Southwold/Reydon. The overwhelming view (68.7% of respondents) was that this would be detrimental to the economy of the town. Any development associated with the potential increased housing in Reydon should therefore be refused on the basis that it would have a significant adverse effect on the facilities already provided in Southwold.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?

Comment ID 1295

Comment The Town centre area for Southwold needs to be expanded to include all the current shops and related premises
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear

Section  Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?

Comment ID  1429

Comment  6. Protection for the Character of Southwold Town Centre
Despite the arrival of a number of multiple retail chains in Southwold, we strongly believe that the vibrancy of the town depends very considerably on the presence of a significant number of independent shops. We think that the area designated as the High Street needs to be extended to include all the commercial area of the town and that provision should be made in the Local Plan to afford these properties protection against the type of conversion/extension that increases rents and makes the premises suitable for multiple retail chains. We are aware that Southwold Town Council is seeking such measures in its work on the Southwold Neighbourhood Plan and would like to see these provisions also included in the Local Plan. Measures could include similar protection for Southwold High Street as currently exists for Lowestoft Town Centre and others specific to Southwold such as the requirement to retain gardens/courtyards at the back of premises.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?

Comment ID 1950

Comment The Southwold Town Centre boundary should include the Adnams Brewery buildings, including the brewery itself, the engineering workshop, the office, the Sole Bay Pub, the sweet shop opposite the Pub and the Swan Hotel Annex. We have attached a copy of Appendix 2 with dotted lines to show the new perimeter, with large dots to show the premises to be included.

Appendix 2 as amended: is attached

We also are of the view that the town centre boundary should be used to protect from residential conversion use classes B1, B2, C1, D1 and D2. All of these use classes can be found in the proposed town centre boundary and promote the vitality of the Southwold town centre. Southwold town centre's vitality derives from its unusual mixture of uses that includes the brewery and supporting facilities, its two churches, several pubs, etc.

This approach also supports attracting knowledge based businesses which seek town centre locations.

In addition, having multiple use classes attracts footfall to the town centre and supports retailers.

At a minimum, the Local Plan should not prevent Southwold or other market towns from developing Neighbourhood Plans to enhance town centre vitality through a mixture of use classes that support each other by generating custom for each other. A visit to the library becomes a visit to the post office, for food shopping and a coffee.

We support a 350 square metre standard for impact assessments.
Terry McDonald

Section
Q56 Do you agree with the town centre boundaries for Lowestoft and the Market Towns as shown in Appendix 2?

Comment ID 114

Comment No, It should be extended to include Waveney Drive and London Road South/South Beach areas.
Q57 Should we define primary and secondary shopping frontages within each town centre and prioritise retail uses within primary frontages?

Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q57 Should we define primary and secondary shopping frontages within each town centre and prioritise retail uses within primary frontages?

Comment ID 1129

Comment yes
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q57 Should we define primary and secondary shopping frontages within each town centre and prioritise retail uses within primary frontages?

Comment ID 1850

Comment Needs further details
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q57 Should we define primary and secondary shopping frontages within each town centre and prioritise retail uses within primary frontages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q57 Should we define primary and secondary shopping frontages within each town centre and prioritise retail uses within primary frontages?

Comment ID 913

Comment Yes.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q57 Should we define primary and secondary shopping frontages within each town centre and prioritise retail uses within primary frontages?

Comment ID 695

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q57 Should we define primary and secondary shopping frontages within each town centre and prioritise retail uses within primary frontages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes - and planning policies should restrict expansion of retail premises into back gardens/courtyards in Southwold as part of measures to retain size of premises suitable for independent shops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terry McDonald

Section Q57 Should we define primary and secondary shopping frontages within each town centre and prioritise retail uses within primary frontages?

Comment ID 115

Comment Petro Square and Commercial road should be primary shopping frontages, along with a re-developed Lake Lothing/Waveney Drive. London Road South should be included as secondary shopping frontage.
Q58 Do you agree with the primary shopping area and primary and secondary shopping frontages shown in appendix 2?

Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q58 Do you agree with the primary shopping area and primary and secondary shopping frontages shown in appendix 2?

Comment ID 1130

Comment yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q58 Do you agree with the primary shopping area and primary and secondary shopping frontages shown in appendix 2?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The primary area in Bungay could be extended along Earsham Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haycock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q58 Do you agree with the primary shopping area and primary and secondary shopping frontages shown in appendix 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne McClarnon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q58 Do you agree with the primary shopping area and primary and secondary shopping frontages shown in appendix 2?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q58 Do you agree with the primary shopping area and primary and secondary shopping frontages shown in appendix 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q59 Should town centre boundaries and associated policies be set out in a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section

Q59 Should town centre boundaries and associated policies be set out in a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID 1131

Comment no
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q59 Should town centre boundaries and associated policies be set out in a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring
Haycock

Section
Q59 Should town centre boundaries and associated policies be set out in a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID 915

Comment Not sure about this. Certainly there should be a guidance document, perhaps in the form of a decision tree requiring Neighbourhood Plans to justify deviations in terms of both local and wider district needs for retail versus other leisure or community opportunities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Q59 Should town centre boundaries and associated policies be set out in a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID 458

Comment Yes
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q59 Should town centre boundaries and associated policies be set out in a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID 1113

Comment I think we the people definitely need to be consulted.
Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>A more flexible approach is required here or properties will just sit empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broads Authority Natalie Beal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>BA and WDC officers have discussed the potential for a consistent policy and mapping approach for the District Centre at Oulton Broad as it is a shared Centre. We look forward to working together to work this up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID 1132
Comment prioritise retail use
CTC John Thompson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Continue to prioritise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>continue to prioritise retail use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID 916

Comment Yes, providing 'prioritise retail use' is not interpreted as 'limit to retail use', i.e. again a decision tree to establish how alternative uses avoid impact upon the viability and vitality of the local centre (e.g. where current usages become obsolete or superfluous in the light of other accessible developments).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClaron</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
<td>Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?

Comment ID 1115

Comment Be more flexible, as cafés and restaurants would bring footfall to the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q60 Should we continue to prioritise retail use in the District centres of Oulton Broad and Kirkley and other local shopping centres or take a more flexible approach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q61 Should we require an impact assessment on all retail proposals with a net retail floor space greater than 350 sqm or rely on the national threshold?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q61 Should we require an impact assessment on all retail proposals with a net retail floor space greater than 350 sqm or rely on the national threshold?

Comment ID 2030

Comment Yes, but has one ever concluded that the proposal can't be accommodated? Any assessment needs to be the subject of rigorous review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section

Q61 Should we require an impact assessment on all retail proposals with a net retail floor space greater than 350 sqm or rely on the national threshold?

Comment ID 1852

Comment
No far too small yet more cost and paperwork go with original recommendation
**CTC John Thompson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q61 Should we require an impact assessment on all retail proposals with a net retail floor space greater than 350 sqm or rely on the national threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q61 Should we require an impact assessment on all retail proposals with a net retail floor space greater than 350 sqm or rely on the national threshold?

Comment ID 1747

Comment 350 sqm
Julian Munson

Section Q61 Should we require an impact assessment on all retail proposals with a net retail floor space greater than 350 sqm or rely on the national threshold?

Comment ID 1168

Comment Yes agree with this point.
John Bumpus

Section Q61 Should we require an impact assessment on all retail proposals with a net retail floor space greater than 350 sqm or rely on the national threshold?

Comment ID 599

Comment Yes, absolutely.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Eade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haycock

Section  
Q61 Should we require an impact assessment on all retail proposals with a net retail floor space greater than 350 sqm or rely on the national threshold?

Comment ID  
917

Comment  
350 sqm feels too high a threshold. Also, 'impact assessment' should not only probe business competition, but should include implications for transport, parking, accessibility, supply chain movements, public realm, environment, noise, and pollution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q61 Should we require an impact assessment on all retail proposals with a net retail floor space greater than 350 sqm or rely on the national threshold?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stick with the 350 sqm criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
john norris

Section Q61 Should we require an impact assessment on all retail proposals with a net retail floor space greater than 350 sqm or rely on the national threshold?

Comment ID 977

Comment yes
Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID 2031

Comment No the market here has changed dramatically in the past few years particularly in relation to public houses and the planning system needs to catch up with this. Use it or lose it should be the approach. Filling stations or churches are just as valuable a facility to the local community but nobody seems to bother when they fall out of use. Why is the planning system obsessed with pubs? The influence of CAMRA in the past few years amongst planners has been disproportionate.
**Beccles Society Paul Fletcher**

**Section**  
Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

**Comment ID**  
1401

**Comment**  
An indoor Swimming pool and Leisure Complex which could be converted into a possible theatre/ meeting room/ cinema would be a useful addition to the infrastructure of Beccles at present (or in the future when growth has occurred) and could be sited on one of the many locations just outside the town put forward as possible housing sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID 206

Comment Yes
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section   Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID  1748

Comment  yes
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID 1886

Comment It is essential to the community of Kessingland that it protects its existing community services and facilities. Over the years there has been a decline on the commercial side with regards to retail shops, due to the A12 bypass being built and the industrial and retail units located south of Lowestoft. Those that are currently in place need to be protected and encouraged to remain part of the community. There is a single primary school which has academy status, it currently has a pupil roll of around 250 with a capacity of around 300 and therefore it is considered by the community important that the school continues to attract sufficient pupils to retain it in the village.

Health services are provided by a single doctors surgery and chemist, the surgery caters for a number of health services. However the surgery covers the three rural villages of Kessingland, Wrentham and Wangford and clearly any major development in the catchment area of the surgery is likely to have a significant impact on the service they provide. With the ageing population, the importance for good access to primary health care services will increase.

During the period of putting the Neighbourhood Plan together the Neighbourhood Planning Team were approached by East Coast Community Healthcare, which has identified a market need to provide sustainable, affordable, quality, full day care across Suffolk and Norfolk, this includes Kessingland.

The provision of such a facility in Kessingland will provide Early Years Services underpinned by ECCH's health and safeguarding services, plus additional wrap around care through holiday and after school clubs. At present many struggle to find pre-school and wrap around care which would otherwise enable them to take up employment opportunities. In addition this will also create new jobs which have the potential to be accessed by local people.

In order to ensure that the scheme can be delivered once funding is in place, the Neighbourhood Plan is allocating land at Francis Road Playing Field – (old disused tennis courts) for the provision of the Early Years Centre and appropriate parking. It will be important that any such provision does not impact detrimentally on the amenity of the residents in Francis Road.
Another health care provider to contact the team was the current management of the Manor Farm Care Home which specialises in the elderly and dementia care for 25 residents. The existing building is an old manor house and unable to manage with the increasing numbers of patients needing the specialised care that it can offer. Therefore they have asked if the land which they own adjacent to the current home can be developed to provide a brand new facility to cater for a wider range of care as opposed to just elderly and those with dementia. It could offer alternative types of care such as respite, end of life care, assisted living, day care centre and short term breaks. This is supported by the local community.

Both the schemes are in the Neighbourhood Plan proposal under draft policies CI3 and CI4.
Haycock

Section

Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID 918

Comment Yes.
Anne McClarnon

Section  Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID  698

Comment  Yes
Nicky Elliott

Section Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID 740

Comment Yes.
Norman Castleton

Section Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID 462

Comment Yes
### Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul Douch

Section  Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID  860

Comment  Yes
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID 118

Comment Yes they should be protected, unless improved equally accessible facilities can be provided locally. There is obviously a strong sense or irony within WDC given that the attached photo is of Beccles Public Hall, one of many community facilities within the town that WDC have failed to maintain to the point that it could have been lost had it not been for the intervention of locals to bring it back into proper use. The Lido and meadow being others, along with the quay and moorings. There is also the lack of proper maintenance of the sports facilities which makes them unavailable during parts of the respective sports seasons.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID 1951

Comment Community facilities should be broadly defined as anything that is of value to the community/used by the community/necessary for a community to function. This definition could therefore include care homes/sheltered accommodation for the elderly; health care facilities; the post office, banks, pubs, theatres, meeting places, church halls, churches, libraries, etc.

Significantly, focus groups conducted for the Southwold Neighbourhood Plan highlighted that the community regards local independent businesses as community facilities because the owners looked after community needs. This might be a way of providing extra protection for local businesses.

The Local Plan should provide maximum protection for existing community facilities and require that alternative community uses be investigated prior to allowing redeveloping or conversion to residential use. Also, business use should be given preference over residential use because there is actually a shortage of space for knowledge based businesses in Southwold. At a minimum we urge that the Local Plan should not undermine Neighbourhood Plans that seek to convert redundant community facilities to business uses.

In Southwold, our NP research revealed that we have lost 31 community facilities and all have been converted to residential use. In fact, residential use is suffocating economic development because of the lack of space for the latter.

It is for the local community to decide which services and facilities are important to them – this should not be set in stone in the Local Plan but the Local Plan should have a mechanism for acknowledging the community’s understanding of importance.

We are strongly of the view that protection should not be limited to buildings that have been listed as Assets of Community Value.
Sport England Philip Raiswell

Section Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

Comment ID 1368

Comment Sport England promote a planned approach to the provision of facilities and opportunities to participate in sport. In doing so we add value to the work of others and help to deliver sustainable development goals through:
* Recognising and taking full advantage of the unique role of sport and active recreation in contributing to a wide array of policy and community aspirations, including leisure, health, and education.
* Using sport and recreation as a fundamental part of the planning and delivery of sustainable communities.
* The development of partnership working using sport and active recreation as a common interest.

In line with the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF para 73), and as presented in the diagram below, we advocate that at the core of planning for sport should be a robust and up-to-date assessment of the needs for sport and active recreational facilities and opportunities for new provision. The results of the assessment should be developed into a clear strategy for meeting the identified needs, integrated into forward planning and applied within development management. By doing so, the planning system will be able to meet the requirements of the NPPF, secure the considerable benefits that positive planning for sport can provide, and help to meet our planning objectives.

In practice, our planning objectives are to:
* Protect existing facilities: We seek to help protect sports and recreational buildings and land including playing fields. We expect these to be retained or enhanced as part of any redevelopment unless an assessment has demonstrated that there is an excess of provision and they are surplus to requirements, or clear evidence supports their relocation. We are a statutory consultee on all planning applications affecting playing field land and will object to such an application unless one of five exceptions applies.
* Enhance the quality, accessibility and management of existing facilities: We wish to see the best use made of existing sports facilities through improving their quality, access and management. We have developed a wide range of supporting advice on understanding and planning for facility provision, including efficient facility management such as community access to school sites.
* Provide new facilities to meet demand: We seek to ensure that communities have access to sufficient high quality sports facilities that are fit for purpose. Using evidence and advocacy, we help to guide investment into new facilities and the expansion of existing ones to meet new demands that cannot be met by existing provision.

With regard to the submitted document itself, Sport England would wish to make the following comments:

Q62 – Community facilities (including sports pitches and indoor sports facilities) should be protected from development in order to help address the recorded low levels of participation in sport in the local area and tackle the high levels of obesity. It is particularly important to protect key sites for sport in the district, as identified in the adopted Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy for Waveney, which form the key evidence base for formulating policies in relation to sport and physical activity in the district.
**Theatres Trust Tom Clarke**

**Section**

Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?

**Comment ID**

629

**Comment**

The Theatres Trust is pleased the scoping document recognises community facilities. The provision of a variety of community infrastructure and cultural facilities are vital for their contribution to residents and visitors life satisfaction and this should be promoted in this plan.

The importance of planning for culture and community facilities is emphasised in the National Planning Policy Framework by being included as a core planning principle (item 17). This is supported by guidance in item 70 of the NPPF which states that to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services that the community needs, planning policies and decisions should guard against unnecessary loss of valued facilities. Also to ensure that established facilities and services are retained and able to develop for the benefit of the community.

It is vital the local plan safeguard and protect existing cultural & community facilities which benefit and support sustainable communities which might otherwise be traded in for more commercially lucrative developments.

To support this, we recommend a policy along the lines of:

**Community and Cultural Facilities**

The council will resist the loss or change of use of existing community and cultural facilities unless replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meet the need of the local population, or necessary services can be delivered from other facilities without leading to, or increasing, any shortfall in provision, and it has been demonstrated that there is no community need for the facility or demand for another community use on site.

The Policy should also contain criteria for encouraging the provision of new facilities to serve the growing population in the District.

For clarity, and so that guidelines are clear and consistent, we recommend that the accompanying text and the Glossary contains an explanation for the term 'community and cultural facilities'. We recommend this succinct all-inclusive description which would obviate the need to provide examples: community and cultural facilities provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q62 Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities as far as it is possible to do so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong> 1458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> Question of meeting adequate level of funding I guess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?

Comment ID 2032

Comment No see polemic above!!!! [No the market here has changed dramatically in the past few years particularly in relation to public houses and the planning system needs to catch up with this. Use it or lose it should be the approach. Filling stations or churches are just as valuable a facility to the local community but nobody seems to bother when they fall out of use. Why is the planning system obsessed with pubs? The influence of CAMRA in the past few years amongst planners has been disproportionate.]
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?

Comment ID 1134

Comment yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC John Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?

Comment ID 1749

Comment yes
Haycock

Section Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?

Comment ID 919

Comment Yes.
Anne McClarnon

Section  
Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?

Comment ID 699

Comment Potentially, yes
Nicky Elliott

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Norman Castleton**

**Section**

Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?

**Comment ID**

463

**Comment**

Only community use allowed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul Douch

Section Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?

Comment ID 861

Comment Yes
Jonathan Blankley

**Section**

Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?

**Comment ID**

119

**Comment**

Yes or there will be a continual erosion of those facilities over the long term, with the almost certain likelihood that they will not be replaced. Many things including sports participation tend to be cyclical, and local government should be aware of changing trends and supporting volunteer groups that provide sporting and leisure facilities. It's not just about having somewhere to live, it's also about having a life.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q63 Where it is not viable or possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment or conversion to residential or commercial use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q64 Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q64 Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Once a service or facility has gone protecting the premises doesn’t protect the service. If a service is required again in due course it will find its own appropriate premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q64 Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Norman Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q64 Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section Q64 Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?

Comment ID 208

Comment No
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q64 Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haycock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q64 Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q64 Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?

Comment ID 742

Comment Yes, ones which require travelling further should be protected more, and ones where there is no alternative (eg. public transport)
Norman Castleton

Section: Q64 Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?

Comment ID: 464

Comment: All community services should be protected
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paul Douch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sport England Philip Raiswell

Section Q64 Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?

Comment ID 1369

Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?

Comment ID 2034

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Norman Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC John Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more flexible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?

Comment ID 533

Comment No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haycock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicky Elliott

Section Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?

Comment ID 743

Comment No. All services and facilities that are used should be protected.
Norman Castleton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Douch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Primarily but not exclusively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No, the presumption should be that they all provide a benefit to the community, so should all receive protection. Once lost they are much harder to replace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q65 Should we only protect services and facilities listed as 'Assets of Community Value'?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?

Comment ID 2035

Comment Yes - See my earlier comments about Commercial Road and Peto Road. [Q12 There are significant area of unused land on both Peto Road and Commercial Road which provide opportunities for commercial development, in addition to a lot of unused railway land, I am aware of the flood risk issues, but subject to satisfactory resolution of these development should be concentrated in these areas. They form a gateway to the town and in the case of Peto Road a link to the retail Park.] [Q25 Flood protection for the town opens up the possibilities of development on both Commercial and Peto Roads and this will be of benefit to the town. In addition it will reduce the cost of regeneration of the Brooke Peninsula and make the construction on the site easier and less expensive.]
### Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Parts of the catchment area of the Kirkley Stream are prone to flooding. Regeneration should not be promoted in areas prone to flooding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?

Comment ID 1857

Comment Yes if suitable building design
Environment Agency

Section Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?

Comment ID 2108

Comment We would be very interested in the responses that you receive to this question, and would welcome discussions of sites that may potentially be brought forward. Any sites which you wish to include within your Local Plan that are at risk of flooding will need to apply the Sequential Test and, where necessary, the Exception Test. We would also encourage you to ensure these sites are considered within your SFRA so that you have a good understanding of the risk before allocating the site. We would like to see your Local Plan take a holistic catchment-based approach to the water environment. Policies should aim to prevent inappropriate development in the floodplain. New development should be resilient to flooding and provide opportunities to improve river environments.
Section Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?

Comment ID 2118

Comment Specific flood risk policies
It would help you consider flood risk at the planning application stage, if you included a policy providing more detail on how growth will be managed in flood risk areas. In line with the Sequential Test, it is important to initially establish if you need to develop land in areas of flood risk. If there is a sufficient supply of land in Flood Zone 1 then it would be useful to acknowledge this in your local plan, and set out any exceptions you may consider. For example extensions to existing properties and change of use. A policy setting out how you will determine if a proposal is safe would also be very beneficial. For example:

- Finished Floor Levels
We strongly advise that proposals for "more vulnerable" (as defined in PPG table 2 Flood risk Vulnerability) development should include floor levels set no lower than 300 millimetres above the level of any flooding that would occur in a 1% (1 in 100) / 0.5% (1 in 200) Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood event (including allowances for climate change). We are likely to raise an objection where this is not achieved in line with Paragraphs 060 of the NPPF's Planning Practice Guidance. This advises that there should be no internal flooding in more vulnerable developments from a design flood. We recommend "less vulnerable" development also meet this requirement to minimise disruption and costs in a flood event. If this is not achievable then it is recommended that a place of refuge is provided above the 0.1% AEP flood level.

- Safe Access
During a flood, the journey to safe, dry areas completely outside the 1% (1 in 100) / 0.5% (1 in 200) AEP flood event, including allowances for climate change, should not involve crossing areas of potentially fast flowing water. Those venturing out on foot in areas where flooding exceeds 100 millimetres or so would be at risk from a wide range of hazards, including, for example; unmarked drops, or access chambers where the cover has been swept away. Safe access and egress routes should be assessed in accordance with the guidance document 'FD2320 (Flood Risk Assessment Guidance for New Developments)'. We would recommend that you refer to Ipswich Borough Council's Level 2 SFRA which has produced a Safety
Framework detailing the flood hazards that would be acceptable for different development vulnerabilities. This could be applicable in Waveney District where areas of flood zone are likely to be developed, for example around Lake Lothing area of Lowestoft

- Emergency Flood Plan
Where safe access cannot be achieved, or if the development would be at residual risk of flooding in a breach, an emergency flood plan that deals with matters of evacuation and refuge should demonstrate that people will not be exposed to flood hazards. The emergency flood plan should be submitted as part of a FRA and will need to be agreed with the Local Council. It would be useful to applicants and the council if your local plan advised what this document should consider. As stated above, refuge should ideally be located 300mm above the 0.1% AEP flood level including allowances for climate change. If you do produce a flood safety framework it will be important to ensure emergency planning considerations and requirements are used to inform it.

- Flood Resilience / Resistance Measures
To minimise the disruption and cost implications of a flood event we encourage development to incorporate flood resilience/resistance measures up to the extreme 0.1% AEP climate change flood level. Again it would be useful for you to include a policy ensuring applicants adopt these measures. Information on preparing property for flooding can be found in the documents 'Improving the Flood performance of new buildings' and 'Prepare your property for flooding'.

- Betterment
Every effort should be made by development to improve the flood risk to the local area, especially if there are known flooding issues. Opportunities should also be taken to provide environmental enhancements as part of the design, for example naturalising any rivers on the site with a buffer zone on both sides.

- Increases in Built Footprint (excluding open coast situations)
When developing in areas at risk of flooding consideration should be given to preventing the loss of floodplain storage. Any increase in built footprint within the 1% AEP, including allowances for climate change, flood extent will need to be directly compensated for to prevent a loss of floodplain storage. If there are no available areas for compensation above the design flood level and compensation will not be possible then a calculation of the offsite flood risk impacts will need to be undertaken. If this shows significant offsite impacts then no increases in built footprint will be allowed. Further guidance on the provision of compensatory flood storage is provided in section A3.3.10 of the CIRIA document C624.
Flood Defence Consent and Environmental Permitting Regulations
On the 6th April 2016, flood defence consents moved into the
Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 system
(EPR). An environmental permit for flood risk activities may be required for
work:
- in, under, over or near a main river (including where the river is in a
culvert)
- on or near a flood defence on a main river
- in the flood plain of a main river
- on or near a sea defence
You should consider this when allocating development sites adjacent to a
'main river'. A permit may be required and restrictions imposed upon the
work as a result in order to ensure the development does not have a
detrimental impact upon the environment and flood risk.
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?

Comment ID 368

Comment No, with global warming and resultant climate change it would be folly to allow any such development.
Haycock

Section
Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?

Comment ID
922

Comment
No feedback.
Norman Castleton

**Section**  Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?

**Comment ID**  466

**Comment**  Lowestoft Lake Lothing areas
Jonathan Blankley

Section  Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?

Comment ID  121

Comment  Only if the new development itself is protected from that risk, and does not push the problem elsewhere. It is ridiculous to develop on known flood risk areas, particularly given the increasing uncertainty over our future weather patterns and the increased likelihood of heavier rainfall events.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?

Comment ID 1952

Comment The Millennium Field opposite the Millennium Hall is a flood risk area which should be developed as an environmentally sensitive car park. More car parking is essential to Southwold and this is the only area in town that could be converted to a car park.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q66 Are there any areas in the District at risk from flooding where development should be promoted to deliver regeneration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Central Lowestoft springs to mind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 2036

Comment Yes – This is a prudent approach.
Bryony Townhill

Section Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 954

Comment Yes, it is irresponsible to build on areas at risk of flooding or erosion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bryony Townhill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 1220

Comment Yes.
Councillor Norman Brooks

**Section**

Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

**Comment ID**

1858

**Comment**

Yes (b) Yes
CTC John Thompson

Section Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 210

Comment a) Yes b) Yes
Environment Agency

Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only

Comment ID 2109

Comment

a) The 2012 Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) for Lowestoft to Landguard Point represents the agreed way forward for sustainable coastal management for the next 100 years. We are working with local authorities to produce the National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping service (NCERM); this should be available by end 2016 for the East Anglian coast. It is important that Council uses these sources of information to produce and update local Coastal Change Management Areas to inform both development opportunities the public.

Coastal change is a natural process that also pose a threat to people and property and its probability and consequence is expected to increase with climate change. Planning for this change can bring multiple benefits including making existing communities more resilient, helping to improve biodiversity, water quality and recreation.

b) It is essential that you produce risk maps to inform and control development opportunities in areas at risk of coastal erosion over the next 100 years. This will help to create a sustainable coastline for the benefit of all. The current policy of only allowing limited safe development in at risk areas is appropriate. Your Local Plan can help to ensure that new developments are resilient over their lifetime and help improve the sustainability of existing communities. Effectively managing coastal change can also improve the economic prospects of affected communities and improve the local environment.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 1888

Comment Since the surge tide event in December 2013 a Multi Agency Group has been set up to monitor the situation at the Benacre Pumping Station and the coastal area around it, described by the Environment Agency "as one of the most vulnerable parts of the Suffolk coastline". There have been several meetings with a number of agencies represented, including a representative from WDC, and plans were put in place to look at a timetable for future works with a coastal study being undertaken by HALCRO, a company of coastal engineers appointed by the Environment Agency. Everybody present agreed that the plan should protect the Benacre Estate farmland, the Kessingland Levels up to the A12 and beyond, the southern edge of Kessingland village around Coopers Drive, the Anglian Water Sewerage Treatment works, and the commercial businesses like Kessingland Beach Holiday Park and Africa Alive. Currently HALCRO are working on providing a number of solutions, with costings with the appropriate modelling which should be complete by mid summer 2016.
Haycock

Section Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 923

Comment 67(a) Yes.
67(b) Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClaronn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | a) Yes  
b) Yes |
Section Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 2204

Comment Coastal issues

Natural England expects the Plan to identify a Coastal Change Management Area and set out the type of policies and developments that would be appropriate in it. The PPG gives guidance on how to define a Coastal Change Management Area as follows:

"Coastal Change Management Area will only be defined where rates of shoreline change are significant over the next 100 years, taking account of climate change. They will not need to be defined where the accepted shoreline management plan policy is to hold or advance the line (maintain existing defences or build new defences) for the whole period covered by the plan, subject to evidence of how this may be secured".

We would also expect the plan to consider the marine environment and apply an Integrated Coastal Zone Management approach. Where marine plans are in place, local plans should also take these into account. More detail about marine plans can be found here, including details on marine plans, which have been finalised (refer to relevant plan).

The plan should refer to the relevant Shoreline Management Plan and take forward applicable actions. Local Authorities should use Shoreline Management plans as a key evidence base for shaping policy in coastal areas. The list of existing SMPs can be found here

Sea level rise and coastal change are inevitable and bring both challenges and opportunities for people and nature. Sustainable coastal management needs to embrace long-term change and achieve positive outcomes for both.

Local Plans should therefore provide for coastal adaptation and work with coastal processes. Plans within coastal areas should recognise the need to respond to changes over long timescales and adopt an integrated approach across administrative and land/sea boundaries. A successful integrated approach should set levels of sustainable levels of economic and social activity whilst protecting the environment.

We would also advise that Local Plans should help facilitate the relocation of valued environmental assets away from areas of risk.
**Norman Castleton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No developments on coastal areas. Proper coastal protection should built</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pamela Cyprien

Section Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 1270

Comment Coastal erosion seems to be happening more quickly over the past few years. Perhaps 100 years should be reduced to 50. Residential development should be restricted and certainly not take place in areas prone to flooding. Flooding events are increasing.
Paul Douch

Section Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 863

Comment a) Yes
b) Yes
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 122

Comment Yes
Yes
### Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

**Section**

Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

**Comment ID**

1299

**Comment**

a) Yes  
b) Yes
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q67 a) Should we continue to identify a Coastal Change Management Area based on the land predicted to be at risk from erosion over the next 100 years? b) If so should residential development continue to be restricted and other types of development only a

Comment ID 1953

Comment Yes
Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?

Comment ID 2037

Comment Yes if they are sustainable and self-funded.
Bourne Leisure Ltd (Lichfields)
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Miss Heslop)

Section Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?

Comment ID 2172

Comment The Corton and Lowestoft Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) states that no active intervention is intended for the coastline within the area. Bourne Leisure would like to take this opportunity to emphasise that emerging development management policies must recognise the role of existing land uses and their development potential when determining the approach to coastal defences.

Bourne Leisure considers that policies in the emerging local plan should support proposals for tourism development within existing site boundaries (including the development of undeveloped areas) or for proposals to expand onto adjoining land not affected by coastal erosion (including open areas), in order to compensate for land lost due to flooding or coastal erosion. In addition, the emerging Plan's policy relating to climate change and erosion should allow operators/landowners to implement, maintain and fund coastal defences and introduce new defences where this helps to protect key, established operations and proposed development.

For sites such as Corton Coastal Village, it is important that Local Plan policies do not preclude appropriate development, where commensurate mitigation measures can be implemented to address both direct and indirect impacts. Therefore Bourne Leisure would suggest that new coastal defence schemes - and the maintenance of both existing and proposed defences - should be supported in principle by policy, if wider benefits for coastal operations and the wider area in relation to the local economy can be demonstrated.
Section Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?

Comment ID 1859

Comment Yes
Environment Agency

Section Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?

Comment ID 2110

Comment The Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) provides sustainable policies for managing flooding from the sea and coastal erosion. There are examples of small scale coastal defence infrastructure implementation within the overarching SMP policy.

In certain cases this may be acceptable if the defence design is a low key "soft" defence with a limited design life. Hard engineered sea defences should be avoided where there is a potential to negatively impact the sustainability of adjacent coastal frontages. Paragraph 168 of the NPPF advises that coastal management objectives should be embedded in local planning policy particularly as development pressure on the coast is increasing. Changes to existing flood and coastal erosion risk management could have an impact on biodiversity and wildlife habitats. The NPPF states that Shoreline Management Plans should inform the evidence base in coastal areas.

The affordability of and the future policies for managing, maintaining and improving flood defences to support both new and existing developments should be fully considered and understood by the Council during the process of the Local Plan's development.

We suggest the Council uses the SFRA, SMP and Catchment Flood Management Plan as evidence base documents, to assist with the consideration of locations for new development, and consider the application of CIL with reference to the dependence of some of the District's key settlements on Flood Risk Management infrastructure. The DEFRA document "Flood and Coastal Resilience Partnership Funding – DEFRA policy statement on an outcome-focused, partnership approach to funding flood and coastal erosion risk management" is another useful document to support evidence base with regard to funding deliverability of new and replacement flood defence infrastructure, in communities where housing growth may be sought.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul Douch

Section Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?

Comment ID 864

Comment Yes
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?

Comment ID 124

Comment We are a relatively small island with a steadily increasing population, and whilst we are not in the same position as the Netherlands, it strikes as a sensible long term policy to protect as much of our land as is possible.
john norris

Section  
Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?

Comment ID  
981

Comment  
yes
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear

Section Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?

Comment ID 1300

Comment Yes. In particular, protection measures are needed for the Blyth estuary and Southwold Harbour as identified by the Blyth Estuary group.
Section Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?

Comment ID 1954

Comment A tight definition of wider benefits would be required to justify the cost of new coastal defence schemes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q68 Should we permit new coastal defence schemes contrary to the approach outlined in the current Shoreline Management Plan or any future Coastal Strategy if wider benefits for the area can be demonstrated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?**

**Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes but subject to environmental and landscape considerations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charles Fortt

Section Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?

Comment ID 1221

Comment Yes.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?

Comment ID 1860

Comment Yes
Environment Agency

Section
Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?

Comment ID
2111

Comment
We believe this is a matter for you to determine however any initiative to ameliorate the social impact of coastal change is welcomed and encouraged.

Paragraph - 94 of the NPPF advises that "you should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations."

There can be wider social, economic and environmental benefits from the relocation of development where climate change is expected to increase flood risk to existing developments. This initiative may help to development better sustainable long-term solution in the future.
Haycock

Section  Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?

Comment ID  925

Comment  Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicky Elliott

Section  Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?

Comment ID  744

Comment  Yes.
Paul Douch

Section Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?

Comment ID 865

Comment Yes
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?

Comment ID 126

Comment Yes particularly if the decision made is not to protect those areas, but those being moved cannot expect to automatically receive an equivalent area to the existing one.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>john norris</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change to areas not at risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section
Q69 Should we continue to allow for the relocation of residential properties and commercial and community properties at risk from coastal change to areas not at risk?

Comment ID
1955

Comment
Yes.
Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 2039

Comment No leave this to the market and have a generic criteria based policy. Without expert guidance, which will be unnecessarily expensive, you may allocate the wrong areas.
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section
Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 1542

Comment
The Broads Authority Issues and Options discuss the issue of landscape sensitivity in the Broads for such development. This study relates to wind turbines as well as solar farms. This study also looked at the boundaries of the Broads. It is requested that Waveney DC consider the study as their approach to renewable energy is worked up. http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/news-and-publications/publications-and-reports/planning-publications-and-reports/landscape-sensitivity-studies
Bryony Townhill

**Section**

Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

**Comment ID**

958

**Comment**

Industrial areas are good sites for renewable energy, since they the buildings are usually horrible to look at anyway and people can't complain if they've got wind turbines or solar panels there as well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charles Fortt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Councillor Norman Brooks**

**Section**

Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

**Comment ID**

1861

**Comment**

No more onshore turbines and we have our fair share of photovoltaic panels
CTC John Thompson

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 211

Comment a) yes b) Would need to consider this in far more depth but generally in remoter rural areas and away from homes. I do not accept they are the blot on the landscape many argue
Gill Armstrong

Section Q70  a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 1889

Comment Renewable energy is a big issue but I do not agree that erecting wind turbines everywhere, addresses the objectives. Apart from them being unsightly, they never recoup the damage to the environment of their construction, transportation and erection and what happens when they come to the end of their lifespan? Look at Gulliver, it has hardly turned all year. I think that all new builds, both residential and business should include solar panels a far less invasive power source.
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 369

Comment Yes. Anywhere which has no particular landscape merit.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 1752

Comment a) yes
b) photovoltaic on potential development land where housing or business use would adversely affect the community
John Trew

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 27

Comment No wind turbines inland.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 1890

Comment Kessingland's experience with wind turbines has not been a happy one since the two turbines were erected on the edge of the village adjacent to Africa Alive. There has been considerable disquiet amongst the residents as to the affect these turbines have on the quality of life and complaints will continue to be made about the affects they have on the community. The offshore wind farms are surely the way forward, with no inconvenience to nearby settlements. In respect of future development within the village incorporated into the policies SA1, SA2, and SA3, will be measures to minimise water and energy consumption, through carefully considered design, layout and orientation of buildings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haycock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | 70(a)  
Yes.  
70(b)  
No feedback. |
**McGregor**

**Section**  
Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

**Comment ID**  
995

**Comment**  
pV panels rather than onshore wind. Less visual and noise impact.
Nicky Elliott

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 745

Comment Yes.
Norman Castleton

Section  Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID  468

Comment  No more on land developments of this nature although panels on roofs should be promoted
Paul Douch

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 866

Comment a) Yes
b) Rural areas or edge of towns - both wind & solar. Where visual impact does not impinge across important landscapes (eg AONBs, narrow river valleys) and noise impact does not affect many residents
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 127

Comment Large onshore wind turbines are undoubtedly a blot on the landscape. I can see the ones at Kessingland from Ellough near Beccles. Solar is less so, but large areas remain unattractive. The best option are for smaller installations on individual properties or within small developments. Alternatively installations such as the one on the sugar beet factory at Cantley are a better option, thus combining them with what is already an industrial site.
john norris

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 983

Comment yes. wind turbines on the coast out at sea and on green land sufficiently away from residential use
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q70 a) Should we identify suitable sites for renewable energy, including onshore wind, in the Local Plan? b) If so which areas of the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology (e.g. wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels)?

Comment ID 1956

Comment Yes. Blyth Road in Southwold has some land which would be suitable for a small scale community solar farm.
Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID 2040

Comment A sustainable show house would be out of date before it was completed and cannot show all the options as some will be either/or. In reality very few spec built homes are sold off plan in this area, even in a booming market, so this approach will have no measurable difference. This process is about educating developers and customers in the benefits of the relevant technology. You could perhaps adopt an incentive based approach which gave a CIL discount for properties with improved energy ratings, as a way of encouraging the switch. Promoting energy saving technology to the public would encourage purchasers to seek out those products when they are making purchasing decisions.
Becky Taylor

Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID 1001

Comment I believe there needs to be flexibility within the local plan to respond to community and grassroots initiatives. Therefore, in addition to any designated sites/schemes, to state that the council will be favourably inclined towards proposals/initiatives/applications emerging from local community groups which aim to tackle the challenges of climate change/carbon reduction within their community even where it is not within locations designated by the council within the local plan.
Bryony Townhill

Section Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID 959

Comment It should be a requirement that new housing is energy efficient - it shouldn't be optional. These changes are a very small cost compared with the total for a new build.
Charles Fortt

Section Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID 1225

Comment It is common sense that all new housing development should be constructed to minimise energy consumption. We are still living with Victorian building standards that are too expensive for lower income households to improve to modern standards. WDC should use whatever power is in its means to bring this about.
Councillor Norman Brooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Reduce upfront costs b) No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID 212

Comment a) Information campaigns and publicity b) Yes
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID 370

Comment Give planning priority to developments where homes are well insulated and have features such as water recycling and solar energy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | a) require performance levels as part of planning approval  
b) yes                                                                                                                                                                                   |
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section

Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID

1073

Comment

Locating new residential development within sustainable locations that are well-located to shops and services, such as our client’s site at land south of Leisure Way, will encourage sustainable transport modes and therefore in turn reduce carbon emissions and help to address climate change.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID 1246

Comment Locating new residential development within sustainable locations that are well-located to shops and services, such as our client’s site at the former Lothington Hospital, will encourage sustainable transport modes and therefore in turn reduce carbon emissions and help to address climate change.
Haycock

Section Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID 927

Comment 71(a)
Provision of cost/benefit (e.g. rate of return on capital) and environmental implications (CO2 and other life-cycle pollution impacts, e.g. in production of electrical components) for each new property.

71(b)
A sustainable show home policy is good, but will be limited to larger developments. Perhaps developers should be encouraged to create virtual show homes too, which will be more generally useful. Also, such 'show homes' should include site-appropriate wildlife-enabling options such as 'swift bricks', boxes for bats and nesting sites for owls.
Nicky Elliott

**Section**  
Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

**Comment ID**  
746

**Comment**  
a) Require all new buildings to be of the Passiv Haus design, encompassing good insulation, renewable energy generation, water and waste management systems, etc. Also ensure good cycle and pedestrian links designed to discourage people from using cars.
b) Yes - Passiv Haus show home.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Norman Castleton| Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions?  
b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate? | 469        | All new builds to include energy saving measures and power production methods including panels                                         |
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

Section
Q71  a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID
1201

Comment
Only build where there is employment close by
Paul Douch

Section

Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID 867

Comment b) Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jonathan Blankley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>john norris</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?

Comment ID 1957

Comment (a) and (b): Encourage new build to have solar panels, and SUDS, including rain water harvesting systems in large developments and water butts in small developments. Also, the local plan should discourage landscaping that paves over gardens and non-permeable paving of drives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher</th>
<th>MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q71 a) How can we encourage new residential developments to reduce their carbon emissions? b) Would a sustainable show home policy as described above be appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Offer incentives to include EE measures Reintroduce food waste recycling asap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?

Comment ID 2041

Comment Yes – subject to viability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charles Fortt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

**Section**  
Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?

**Comment ID**  
1863

**Comment**  
If cost efficient
### CTC John Thompson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yer, of course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?

Comment ID 534

Comment Yes.
Haycock

Section Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?

Comment ID 928

Comment Providing it can be established that such standards do not lead to 'sick building syndrome'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McGregor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pamela Cyprien

Section Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?

Comment ID 1271

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul Douch</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes, of course!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?

Comment ID 129

Comment You should require ALL developments to meet higher standards given that as a country we are not self sufficient in energy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>john norris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

**Section**
Q72 Should we still require new school and office development to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?

**Comment ID**
1462

**Comment**
Should be fundamental to development
Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Comment ID 2042

Comment Q73 and 74. Our, as yet unbuilt, scheme for the Pegasus Boatyard, which will hopefully commence in September will take design to a new level for the town. Design in this and many similar towns has evolved around "safe" in commercial terms and "cheap" as a result of the overall lack of buoyancy in the market. Whilst good design – of itself - does not cost more, it so often requires much higher specs for materials to produce the desired result. For example, changing from plastic to aluminium windows in a 4 bed house would add around £6000 to the cost. Changing from a smooth faced red brick to one with a more handmade appearance would add around another £1000 to the cost. Changing the bonding to something more attractive, increases wastage and hence cost. All of these would improve the appearance and durability of the product and in premium housing purchasers will pay. Unfortunately we do not operate, for the most part, in a premium market

There are simple lessons which can be learnt about proportions, ratios of window openings to wall space and roof detailing which can improve appearance. These have been covered extensively in various design guides following the original publication of the Essex Design Guide in December 1973.

In my view that document remains the best of the bunch and perhaps should be used to inspire the future. This should be achieved by a demonstration that "good design" adds value, not cost and not by the assertion of the individual views of officers that this or that is good or bad, or by rigorous policies requiring "good design".
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Comment ID 1138

Comment Instead of having several small open spaces have one large open space but ensure adequate space to maintain some privacy and adequate sound insulation and adequate parking.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Comment ID 1892

Comment Development should demonstrate that it represents high quality and sustainable design. In particular proposals should:

- create places and spaces for people
- reflect local character and distinctiveness
- protect local amenity
- create safe, healthy and accessible environments
- make good provision for access by all transport modes
- ensure adequate vehicle parking facilities are provided in line with NP policies TM1 and TM2, with off-road parking spaces designed so that they will be used for parking e.g. the use of car ports instead of garages
- ensure accessible environments that give priority to pedestrian and cycle access and provide linkages and integration with surrounding housing, employment services, facilities and spaces
- provide, conserve and enhance biodiversity and create linkages between green spaces and wildlife corridors
- incorporate Sustainable Drainage Schemes unless following adequate assessment, soil conditions and/or engineering feasibility demonstrates this method is inappropriate.
- Incorporate measures to minimise water and energy consumption, through carefully considered design, layout, and orientation and to make provision for recycling waste, in particular ensuring the adequate bin storage area are provided.
Haycock

Section Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Comment ID 929

Comment Inclusion of open spaces and realistic recognition of parking needs.
Norman Castleton

Section  
Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Comment ID 471

Comment  
The Taylor and Green designed council housing and private housing are the only well designed examples of housing within the landscape I can think of in the area. I cannot think of any recent residential developments that are well designed.
Jonathan Blankley

**Section**

Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

**Comment ID**

131

**Comment**

A well designed development meets the needs of its occupants, improves the quality of the neighbourhood, and adds to the community as a whole. Unfortunately there have been few of these within Beccles, as most seem to be more brick boxes built for profit that could be anywhere in the country.
**john norris**

**Section**

Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

**Comment ID**

1024

**Comment**

a good mix of traditional style quality built 2,3 and 4 bedroom homes. The persimmon estate on the eastern side of beccles
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Comment ID 1007

Comment At the least they should include solar roofs and permiable hard standing drives etc for soak away. The nicest looks are local developer Saberton. We could even dare I say be modern rather than constantly looking back for design inspiration look at what the continental developed.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section  Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Comment ID  1432

Comment  8. Design Principles
Reydon and especially Southwold have a mix of architectural styles some of which are distinctly quirky. Whilst the Society is in general keen to see the preservation of the existing architectural heritage, we are not opposed, per se, to the use of contemporary styles in new building and they are generally to be preferred to pastiche.
Parking standards must seek to ensure that streets are kept free of excessive parking both to ease congestion and improve the streetscape environment.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Comment ID 1959

Comment A well designed development understands and responds sympathetically to the character of an area and fits into the landscape. Careful attention is paid to the quality of detailing, and the use of natural materials that soften with age – not plastic windows or resin slates or concrete roof tiles. Visual balance is very important to create harmony. Also, simplicity. Pastiche historic styles do not work because of changes in craftsmanship and industrial production of materials. Windows are the eyes of a building and careful attention should be given to their size, placement, relationship to each other, and materials. One should be able to find one’s place within a development so each street should have distinctive features and landmarks. Trees should be generously planted along wide verges, and there should be sufficient space around trees so that they can mature without looking stunted. Landscaping should be designed to encourage wildlife habitat and biodiversity. In Southwold, we can point to two developments that show aspects of high quality design – on East Street (although the paving is disappointing because non-permeable and there is a lack of landscaping) and the new service station, where the planning teams of Waveney, Southwold and the Suffolk Preservation Society worked very hard to obtain a good result.
Suffolk Police Alan Keely

Section  Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Comment ID  346

Comment  An example of a good design is one which incorporates good architectural design with consideration for the principles of Secured by Design. It is recognised that there will always need to be compromise but too often in the past designers have created areas which are susceptible to crime and the fear of crime. Once established it is difficult or impossible to rectify. Additional aspects of good design from a designing out crime perspective would also include provision of natural surveillance over public areas, careful design of parking areas and the provision of defensible space.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section  
Q73 What makes a well designed development? Can you give any examples of new developments which you think are well designed?

Comment ID  
1463

Comment  
Individual taste re new build
**Q74 How can we improve design quality through planning policy?**

**John Trew**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q74 How can we improve design quality through planning policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Car parking is a major issue in any development. It is vital that steps are taken to ensure housing has sufficient parking and that pavement/on road parking is restricted. Commercial vehicles parking restricted. Extensions to starter homes prevented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haycock

Section Q74 How can we improve design quality through planning policy?

Comment ID 930

Comment Realistic levels of storage provision, garden sizes and parking needs, plus some diversity to avoid banal vernaculars of the built environment and promote well-being.
Nicky Elliott

Section Q74 How can we improve design quality through planning policy?

Comment ID 748

Comment Require sustainable features such as the Passiv Haus design for new buildings, and require direct sustainable transport links within and to and from developments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Q74 How can we improve design quality through planning policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Keep to traditional designs from periods when quality counted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear

Section Q74 How can we improve design quality through planning policy?

Comment ID 1304

Comment Design guidance in areas adjacent to, or within, the AONB should promote the use of materials sympathetic to the landscape and discourage pastiche design. Guidance should also include requirements for energy conservation and renewable energy, including the use of double glazing and solar panels in conservation areas.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear

Section Q74 How can we improve design quality through planning policy?

Comment ID 1433

Comment The Local Plan must include some key design principles to encourage innovation which is in keeping with the landscape, discourage pastiche and, above all, promote low energy and sustainable development. This should include a requirement for renewable energy systems wherever possible in new housing, including in conservation areas.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q74 How can we improve design quality through planning policy?

Comment ID 1960

Comment Strict validation requirements would be very helpful. We see poor documentation in many applications, including drawings lacking detail, accurate dimensions and context information. Detail is everything and this needs to be acknowledged. For example, in a recent development on Ferry Road (a Conservation Area), the house is built of dark wood but the windows are white plastic!! We would urge greater use of the Suffolk Design Review panel and pre-planning consultation with the parish council and the Suffolk Preservation Society. The Design and Conservation Officers should be actively engaged. We find their input very helpful especially when it is part of a dialogue with the Town Council. These conversations should be encouraged. More attention should be paid to the views of the Parish Council and the community, which have to live with bad design. There should be a recognition that bad design has an adverse impact on the quality of life, just as beauty enhances the quality of life. WDC should take seriously the NPPF admonition that planning should provide an opportunity to replace mediocre design with high quality design so that in the case of conversions, there should be a requirement to fix past mistakes.
Suffolk Police Alan Keely

Section Q74 How can we improve design quality through planning policy?

Comment ID 347

Comment Although Suffolk is one of the safest counties in England we must continue to be aware of the ability to create designs that can help to reduce crime. Local policy can ensure that designers must comply with evidence based recommendations when designing new residential and commercial developments. Secured by Design is the Police preferred specification for new developments and the advice and recommendations contained in Homes 16 is based on sound evidence and research. Too often this area of design is omitted and this needs to be redressed.

Police Designing Out Crime Officers DOCOs are employed in all areas of Suffolk and are experts in designing out crime. Their role is to work with designers at the earliest stages to ensure that all aspects of Secured by design are incorporated.

Local policy should state clearly that all new developments of 10 properties or more should seek at least a Bronze Secured by Design award or higher. This will ensure that all applications of this size will be fit for purpose and will reduce the chances of crime occurring.

Local police could also encourage designers of major developments to seek early consultation with the local DOCO so that layout considerations to deter crime can be considered and incorporated.
Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 2043

Comment No. Design briefs for the larger site would be useful, so that developers know in advance exactly what is required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC John Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 1074

Comment The requirement for good design is a key strand running through national planning policy, as set out at Chapter 7 of the NPPF. Detailed design guidance can be a useful tool in ensuring developments are designed to a high quality, provided that policy is not so onerous that it becomes restricting.

It is considered appropriate that detailed design guidance is only prepared for the larger sites. For the smaller sites, a general policy on design principles will be sufficient to ensure that developments are appropriately designed. Onerous design guidelines on smaller sites could be off-putting to developers and prevent them from bringing forward innovative design.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd
Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

**Section**

Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?

**Comment ID**

1247

**Comment**

The requirement for good design is a key strand running through national planning policy, as set out at Chapter 7 of the NPPF. Detailed design guidance can be a useful tool in ensuring developments are designed to a high quality, provided that policy is not so onerous that it becomes restricting.

It is considered appropriate that detailed design guidance is only prepared for large strategic sites. For smaller sites, a general policy on design principles will be sufficient to ensure that developments are appropriately designed. Onerous design guidelines on smaller sites could be off-putting to developers and prevent them from bringing forward innovative design.
Haycock

Section Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 931

Comment Detailed guidance should be generally applicable to developments and be consistent with Building for Life 12. For sites of more than 20 dwellings, the new traffic's impact upon prevailing traffic flows should be assessed by modelling techniques of a sophistication appropriate to the scale of the development.
Nicky Elliott

Section  
Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?

Comment ID  
749

Comment  
All sites.
| Norman Castleton |
|------------------|----------------|
| Section          | Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan? |
| Comment ID       | 472            |
| Comment          | Design guidance should be provided for all sites |
Jonathan Blankley

**Section**

Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?

**Comment ID**

132

**Comment**

All sites should have some guidance, but the larger the site, the more impact it has and therefore the more detailed the guidance should be.
**Section**

Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?

**Comment ID**

1026

**Comment**

for all sites
**Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown**

**Section**

Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?

**Comment ID**

2080

**Comment**

[Finally,] we think that the new Local Plan must include some key design principles to encourage innovation which is in keeping with the landscape, discourage pastiche and, above all, promote low energy and sustainable development. This should include a requirement for renewable energy systems wherever possible in new housing, including in conservation areas. Parking standards must seek to ensure that streets are kept of excessive parking both to ease congestion and improve the streetscape environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### St John's Hall Farms
Bidwells (John Long)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>St John's Hall Farms suggest that the Local Plan should not provide detailed design guidance. This would be onerous and add delays to delivering planning applications. Rather the Local Plan should have key design principles included. Any detailed guidance should be included in Supplementary Planning Guidance documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Police Alan Keely

Section Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 348

Comment Ideally the local plan should have specific recommendations for designing out crime at the earliest stages of design. These recommendations are often inexpensive and can result in less management input for landlords and less problems for owner occupiers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Q75 Should we provide detailed design guidance in the Local Plan applicable to all sites or should detailed design guidance be prepared just for larger sites specifically identified in the Local Plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>2228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>The Slater Family suggest that the Local Plan should not provide detailed design guidance. This would be onerous and add delays to delivering planning applications. Rather the Local Plan should have key design principles included. Any detailed guidance should be included in Supplementary Planning Guidance documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?

Comment ID 2044

Comment Not if it is applied subjectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor**  
**Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The benefits of the ability of Buildings for Life 12 to improve the design quality of new development are recognised, however this should be informed as guidance rather than policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The benefits of the ability of Building for Life 12 to improve the design quality of new development is recognised, however this should be informed as guidance rather than policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes, Building for Life 12 should be used as a tool to improve the design and quality of new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne McClarnon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
john norris

Section Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?

Comment ID 1027

Comment yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Police Alan Keely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q76 Should Building for Life 12 be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first paragraph within BfL12 states:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Building for Life campaign is about guiding the better planning of new development through urban design that is safe and provides everything that should be expected of a new community.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would support this statement and would urge designers and developers to make early contact with the DOCO to ensure that all aspects of design are considered to ensure that a design promotes safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q77 Should large scale developments in the form of new settlements or urban extensions be required to follow 'garden city' development principles?

**Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder**

**Section**

Q77 Should large scale developments in the form of new settlements or urban extensions be required to follow 'garden city' development principles?

**Comment ID**

2045

**Comment**

You may find these to be at odds with your density aspirations. Whatever they may be.

New development should be laid out to achieve the best use of physical features on the site. Good connectivity with the existing community and coherent open space. The constraints imposed both by highways and drainage can often dictate- to a large extent the form that a layout must take and regard must be had to that.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Councillor Norman Brooks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q77 Should large scale developments in the form of new settlements or urban extensions be required to follow 'garden city' development principles?

Comment ID 1756

Comment yes
John Trew

Section  Q77 Should large scale developments in the form of new settlements or urban extensions be required to follow ‘garden city’ development principles?

Comment ID  29

Comment  Absolutely. Garden city type developments are far better. Just look at Welwyn and Letchworth – lovely places to live.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q77 Should large scale developments in the form of new settlements or urban extensions be required to follow 'garden city' development principles?

Comment ID 703

Comment I think this would get a lot of positive support, yes.
Norman Castleton

Section | Q77 Should large scale developments in the form of new settlements or urban extensions be required to follow 'garden city' development principles?

Comment ID | 474

Comment | It would be a better idea than what exists at the moment
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q77 Should large scale developments in the form of new settlements or urban extensions be required to follow 'garden city' development principles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
john norris

Section Q77 Should large scale developments in the form of new settlements or urban extensions be required to follow 'garden city' development principles?

Comment ID 1028

Comment no. If large scale developments are necessary local needs should take priority in planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Police Alan Keely

Section Q77 Should large scale developments in the form of new settlements or urban extensions be required to follow 'garden city' development principles?

Comment ID 350

Comment The principles of Garden City design make no direct reference to Safety or Security and focus very much on aesthetics. Bearing in mind that the concept of garden cities is over 100 years old it is necessary to consider modern issues that are a feature of new and developing communities. The original Garden Developments were good in Urban Design terms. However these principles have been altered and amended over the years. Therefore it is not clear now exactly what these standard principles are. However giving people space to play in and enjoy in the public realm which also encourages social interaction, creating defensible space for householders, having good natural surveillance from ground floor active rooms, car parking strategies that are well thought out and follow advice from Manual for Street can all be advantageous.
| Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher          |
| MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)                        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q77 Should large scale developments in the form of new settlements or urban extensions be required to follow 'garden city' development principles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Tried and tested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? b) If so what should it be?

Andrew Nainby

Section Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments?
b) If so what should it be?

Comment ID 966

Comment Not more than 20 dwellings per hectare
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) If so what should it be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – this is a market issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers**

| Section | Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments?  
b) If so what should it be? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>maximum of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Norman Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) If so what should it be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>No each site and area will have a different criteria, requirement or function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? b) If so what should it be?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment  | a) yes  
b) 30                                                                                                          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>John Trew</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Section** | Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments?  
b) If so what should it be? |
| **Comment ID** | 30 |
| **Comment** | Minimum density is preferable for many reasons: A better environment for residents; better for wildlife; less car parking; a more relaxed environment. |
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section  Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments?  
          b) If so what should it be?

Comment ID  1076

Comment  There is benefit in setting minimum housing densities to ensure the  
          optimum number of homes are delivered on sites and to assist in  
          addressing the growing demand for housing. However, any policy should  
          acknowledge that different densities will be appropriate in different  
          locations, such as urban and rural areas. There must also be flexibility  
          worked into any policy to ensure that suitable development sites are not  
          restricted from development where the minimum housing density cannot  
          be met for a justified reason but the site is otherwise suitable for  
          development. In some instances, enforcing minimum housing densities may  
          be too restrictive and unnecessarily compromise design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? b) If so what should it be?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>There is benefit in setting minimum housing densities to ensure the optimum number of homes are delivered on sites and to assist in addressing the growing demand for housing. However, any policy should acknowledge that different densities will be appropriate in different locations, such as urban and rural areas. There must also be flexibility worked into any policy to ensure that suitable development sites are not restricted from development where the minimum housing density cannot be met for a justified reason but the site is otherwise suitable for development. In some instances, enforcing minimum housing densities may be too restrictive and unnecessarily compromise design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haycock

Section  Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? 
b) If so what should it be?

Comment ID  933

Comment  No. Otherwise conflict with a well-designed public realm will arise, e.g. no open spaces and conservation zones or well laid-out parking, and risk of disharmony with contiguous built environment.
Anne McClaron

Section Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? b) If so what should it be?

Comment ID 704

Comment Yes. It should be generous, i.e. far fewer houses per hectare. We want to avoid crowding people in.
Norman Castleton

Section Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? b) If so what should it be?

Comment ID 476

Comment Reduce density and build higher or in terraces as appropriate to the area
**Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling**

**Section**
Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments?  
b) If so what should it be?

**Comment ID**
1678

**Comment**
We should not set a minimum, the need is to set a new, reduced, maximum. 50 dwellings per hectare is too many. Too many vehicles are parked on the roadside when the maximum is allowed.
Pamela Cyprien

Section Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? 
b) If so what should it be?

Comment ID 1272

Comment 25/30 dwelling
Jonathan Blankley

Section  Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? b) If so what should it be?

Comment ID  139

Comment  Land is at a premium so its efficient use is important so a minimum is appropriate. However if the move from 20 to 30 results in the roads being clogged by cars as in the middle photo, then perhaps 20 should be the start. The density within each site should be considered independently, as squeezing 4 bedroom homes together into a site to meet a target would not be appropriate, whereas building 2 bedroom houses or flats might meet the target easily.
john norris

Section Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments?
b) If so what should it be?

Comment ID 1029

Comment no minimum
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? b) If so what should it be?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Housing density should be maximised in order to limit the encroachment of settlements into the countryside but also judged in their local context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? b) If so what should it be?

Comment ID 1964

Comment We suggest no minimum housing density standards because the extent of density will depend on context and the quality of the urban design. Density should be a factor in applying Building for Life 12.
**St John's Hall Farms**  
**Bidwells (John Long)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? b) If so what should it be?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>St John's Hall Farms suggest that the Local Plan should not set minimum housing design for new development. This is far too prescriptive and could mean sites do not properly reflect local character or be responsive to the local housing market which will inevitable change over the lifetime of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments? b) If so what should it be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>2229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>The Slater Family suggest that the Local Plan should not set minimum housing design for new development. This is far too prescriptive and could mean sites do not properly reflect local character or be responsive to the local housing market which will inevitable change over the lifetime of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher</td>
<td>MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q78 a) Should we set a minimum housing density for new developments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) If so what should it be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Should be based around prevailing character unless and site specific issues dictate otherwise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)**

**Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>If a principle of “good design” is applied then that should be sufficient. If there is insufficient space between properties then the site is being overdeveloped and planning permission can be refused.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID 1140

Comment possibly
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID 1868

Comment No each site will vary with all the other costs imposed on developers need to raise money somehow
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Trew

Section
Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID
31

Comment
Design principles are vital. No-one wants to live check by jowl with their neighbours.
John Trew

Section Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID 32

Comment Yes.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor  
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section  Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID  1077

Comment  It is inevitable that the design of housing developments will differ according to density. There is benefit in providing detailed design principles relating to densities as guidance within Supplementary Planning Documents. However, design principles should focus on promoting high quality design whilst not being restrictive to innovative development and therefore it is appropriate that design principles form guidance rather than policy.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID 1250

Comment It is inevitable that the design of housing developments will differ according to density. There is benefit in providing detailed design principles relating to densities as guidance within Supplementary Planning Documents. However, design principles should focus on promoting high quality design whilst not being restrictive to innovative development and therefore it is appropriate that design principles form guidance rather than policy.
Haycock

Section Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID 934

Comment Such guidance seems desirable.
McGregor

Section
Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID
997

Comment
It's a matter of balance. Large detached property needs some space or looks ridiculous.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes, the use of terraces as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID 144

Comment Yes, the design principles should reflect the development, but without compromising the quality of the build and the external design. Whether detached, semi or terraced, they will all benefit from good design.
Peter Eyres

Section Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID 1421

Comment Let's face it, Victorian terraced housing is one of the most efficient and successful ways of achieving a high density of housing; the conundrum is what to do with the car in such a context.
Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings)

Comment ID: 1030

Comment: Different design principles should be applied to each development based on locality
| Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher  
| MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon) |
|---|---|
| **Section** | Q79 Should different design principles be applied to housing development at high/low densities? (For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings) |
| **Comment ID** | 1466 |
| **Comment** | Not necessarily |
Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?

Comment ID 2048

Comment No. These are not justified by local circumstance.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?

Comment ID 1141

Comment yes
Environment Agency

Section Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?

Comment ID 2112

Comment Using water wisely is vital to sustaining and improving our shared local environment. Government has given us the duty to conserve, manage and secure the proper use of water resources in England. Additional abstraction to meet development need has the potential to cause significant environmental damage on a local basis. Anything that can be done to prevent an increase in abstraction will be very welcome. We support the use of water efficiency measures to reduce demand on water resources or in order to accommodate growth in housing and population requirements without the need to increase overall consumption. The NPPF (paragraph 59) states "consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes"; this could include water efficiency and be developed for use in development management. However, these would need to be justified with local evidence and not threaten the financial viability of development.

We strongly encourage you to include a policy requiring higher standards of water conservation than the current building regulation minimums. All new homes should continue to meet the mandatory national standard set out in the Building Regulations of 125 litres/person/day (l/p/d). Where there is a clear local need, you can require new dwellings meet the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 l/p/d (as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance).

We would be happy to provide evidence to support you achieving this tighter building regulation for example through our Water Stressed Areas Classification 2013, River Basin Management Plans or other local evidence, like water cycle studies. Further to this we would encourage you to require new flats to be individually metered (recent research by the University of Southampton suggests customers with a meter use on average 16.5 % less water than those not metered. In 2013/14 45% of homes in England had a meter, and it is expected this will gradually increase to 82% by 2040.)

There are many benefits of encouraging water efficient buildings, including:
- savings on energy use and carbon, which will help you achieve your own CO2 emission targets;
- Help deliver our Water Framework Directive (WFD) commitments.
- Reduce stress on our watercourses, leaving more water in rivers and the ground to benefit the environment and abstractors;
- Make us more resilient to a changing climate; and
- Contribute to sustainable growth.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Only with regard to water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?

Comment ID 1078

Comment The council should not adopt technical housing standards as this will generate unnecessary additional costs for the developer and affect the affordability of schemes. The national space standards would also restrict the mix of housing that could be provided and create additional burdens in an already weak housing market. Should the space standards be adopted on new residential development, this could lead to other elements of schemes being unduly compromised.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section  Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?

Comment ID  1251

Comment  The council should not adopt technical housing standards as this will generate unnecessary additional costs for the developer and affect the affordability of schemes. The national space standards would also restrict the mix of housing that could be provided and create additional burdens in an already weak housing market. Should the space standards be adopted on new residential development, this could lead to other elements of schemes being unduly compromised.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pamela Cyprien</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?

Comment ID 145

Comment The developers comments are entirely predictable as their only objective is profit. The council should adopt all policies that improve the quality of local housing. The mix on developments should be determined by the council and not the developer in what is in the best interest of the local community as a whole.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Norris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Rentplus UK Ltd**  
Tetlow King Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The Council should fully assess the local need for and viability impacts of any planned introduction of either the national space or accessibility standards. Both these aspects are requirements for their introduction, as set out in the PPG, as is the requirement that these should be introduced through a Local Plan policy. The Council should ensure that any plan to introduce either of the standards will not adversely impact on the ability to deliver housing to meet local needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?

Comment ID 1965

Comment Yes. We find that some developments in Southwold have less than the minimum national internal space standard and that this affects the amenity of their occupants. Cases in point: the British Legion redevelopment (a private development); Duncan's Yard (social housing where, according to the plans, 17 of the 20 units will be sub-national standard. We do not agree with developers that providing sub-national standard space is essential to viability.

Two examples: the Hastoe social housing estate on Blyth Road and the proposed development of the old service station site on Station Road in Southwold where 9 units have more than the minimum required space.

There is a justification for importing national standards into the Local Plan because the "free" market, due to chronic under-supply, does not deliver choice. National standards are one of the few ways to mitigate profit maximisation at the expense of the consumer.

With regard to social housing, there is an argument to be made that public sector housing should meet the standards set by the government. We note that the Hastoe Housing Association has a policy of building to more than the minimum standards.
| **St John's Hall Farms**  
| **Bidwells (John Long)** |
| **Section** | Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development? |
| **Comment ID** | 1394 |
| **Comment** | St John’s Hall Farms suggest that the Local Plan should not include additional Housing Standards unless there is a very good reason for doing so. To do so could affect the viability of some schemes and the affordability of some homes. The Building Regulations will change to achieve the same outcomes, which is a more appropriate method of securing higher building standards. |
Section Q80 Should we adopt additional optional technical housing standards in respect of water, access and national space standards for new residential development?

Comment ID 2230

Comment The Slater Family suggest that the Local Plan should not include additional Housing Standards unless there is a very good reason for doing so. To do so could affect the viability of some schemes and the affordability of some homes. The Building Regulations will change to achieve the same outcomes, which is a more appropriate method of securing higher building standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D J Turrell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Trew</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section       Residential Back Gardens

Comment ID    1306

Comment       The plan should require exceptional justification for development in back
gardens, especially in the overcrowded town of Southwold where this
should rarely, if ever, be permitted
**Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?**

**Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Where reasonable access can be achieved, where sufficient garden is left with the donor property and where a satisfactory relationship results from the proposed development. &quot;back land development&quot;, as much of this is so often called, is not necessarily a bad thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>When it creates an increase in housing density beyond an acceptable level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When it creates overcrowding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Case by case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D J Turrell

Section  Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?

Comment ID  77

Comment  when a large number of local people in road / area object to this build
D J Turrell

Section Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?

Comment ID 773

Comment Tandem building, strong objection from local residents, will change character of road/area
### Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>very rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Eade</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Only if the development is of a very high standard and relates to the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee**

**Section**
Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?

**Comment ID**
1893

**Comment**
Paragraph 53 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:-
"Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area".

The Neighbourhood Planning Team having considered garden development came up with Policy H2 which states:-
"Within the physical limits boundary of Kessingland, planning permission for residential development proposals on infill and backland sites will be permitted subject to the following conditions

- Proposals should reflect the character of the surrounding area and protect the amenity of neighbours. It should reinforce the uniformity of the street, by reflecting the scale, mass, height and form of its neighbours. In particular this relates to:
  - plot width
  - the building line
  - visual separation
  - building heights and
  - boundary treatment.

- Proposals that would lead to over development of a site or the appearance of cramming will be resisted. It should be demonstrated that development is of a similar density to properties in the immediate surrounding area "

www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/newwaveneylocalplan 1912
Anne McClarnon

Section Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?

Comment ID 706

Comment When there's noise, light and other sensory issues (i.e. smells) that might impact on neighbours. Also, there should be considerations re. planting and large extensions. I'm currently overlooked by three houses with further loft conversions that feel more like "watch towers" than sensitive, neighbourly conversions. It isn't nice or pleasant to sit out in my own (even smaller garden than theirs).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Almost always - see answer above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section  Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?

Comment ID  1966

Comment  We support discouraging development in back gardens and courtyards in Southwold because of its particular circumstances – it is already a densely developed town and a key element of the character of the town is the rear "secret" spaces which lighten the fabric of the town. There are very few properties in Southwold with largish gardens and we would like to keep those, especially because these are attractive to families and we would like to see more families living in Southwold. In other communities, small buildings of significant architectural character could be viable in large gardens. If a building is originally described as a studio or work space, planning conditions should be imposed to prevent its future use as a holiday let.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q81 When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong> 1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> Should only be restricted where residential amenity significantly affected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Schemes of more than 30, unless there is provision within 1000 metres which can be upgraded. In which case this could be addressed by commuted sum. There is no point in the council taking on more and more, small play areas for maintenance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>It should be considered per dwelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Dependant on existing local amenities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?

Comment ID 1761

Comment current policy is appropriate
John Eade

Section
Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?

Comment ID
536

Comment
All developments should include sufficient green space as gardens for each dwelling both for the welfare of the inhabitants and also to allow nature to thrive. Separate recreational open space tends to be designed for younger children and has only limited value for the wider community. The current requirements for recreational space appear adequate.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?

Comment ID 1895

Comment The Waveney Open Space Needs Assessment, published in 2015, identifies Kessingland has no parks or gardens to serve its population. For its population, an acceptable level of provision would be approximately 1.75 hectares. The Assessment states that Kessingland should have access to at least one open space that is of the quality equivalent to a park. It is not possible to provide a park or equivalent space within Kessingland, or to improve access to the beach as an alternative open space. As is recognised by the Open Space Needs Assessment, the Playing Fields, which will be enlarged through the delivery of additional formal open space through the LOW10 allocation and the delivery of Policy SA2 (Land at Laurel Farm), this can provide a multi-functional open space. However the nature of formal playing pitch provision means this space will not be able to completely undertake the function of a park.

The community, in recognition of the lack of such provision, has identified the importance of its network of smaller green spaces, in particular in terms of the role it plays in making Kessingland a 'green' and rural village. The National Planning Policy Framework gives neighbourhood plans the opportunity to designate Local Green Spaces which are of particular importance to the local community. Paragraph 77 states that Local Green Spaces should only be designated:

• where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;

• where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of it beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of it wildlife; and

• where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

The Waveney Open Space Needs Assessment recognised that many of the amenity spaces are 'passive' spaces because they offer limited value to residents as useable space, at present their value is solely provided by the visual amenity they create. The Assessment recommended "Providing ancillary facilities such as seating and planting on passive amenity spaces could assist with creating walking routes to destinations
such as the village centre, beach or the playing field that could encourage people to more active"

A full list of the Green Spaces to be designated is attached to draft Neighbourhood Plan Policy E1, the policy goes on to add that proposals for built development on the Local Green spaces will not be permitted unless the proposal is of a limited nature and it can be clearly demonstrated that it is required to solely to enhance the role and function of an identified Local Green Space.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?

Comment ID 1079

Comment The importance of residential developments providing on-site open space is recognised. However, consideration should be given to a site’s location and the availability of nearby open space when considering the on-site open space requirement of a particular development. For example, the site at land south of Leisure Way is located in close proximity to considerable areas of existing designated open space to the east and the south of the site. Therefore, the location of a site and its relationship and proximity to existing open space should be considered when deciding the appropriate amount of open space to be delivered on site. It is appropriate that thresholds for on-site open space are set as guidance rather than policy, which will provide greater flexibility in the consideration of site specific circumstances.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?

Comment ID 1252

Comment The importance of providing on-site open space on residential developments is recognised. However, consideration should be given to a site’s location and the availability of nearby open space when considering the on-site open space requirement of a particular development. The site at Lothingland Hospital has easy access to open countryside to the north, east and west of the site. There is also a large area of designated public open space located within easy walking distance of the site, approximately 0.3 miles (0.5km) to the south-east. When considering appropriate open space requirements to be delivered on-site, sites should therefore be considered taking account of their location and relationship and proximity to existing open space. It is appropriate that thresholds for on-site open space are set as guidance rather than policy, which will provide greater flexibility in the consideration of site specific circumstances.
Norman Castleton

Section: Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?

Comment ID: 479

Comment: Already catered for in existing plans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jonathan Blankley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rosemary Simpson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section Q82 What size residential development should provide on-site recreational open space?

Comment ID 1468

Comment Perhaps 10 but the real problem is funding upkeep etc as WDC seems reluctant to take on liability
Q83 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments.

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q83 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 2051

Comment This should be a needs based policy not an "absolute provision" policy. If there is no need then there should be no requirement to provide.
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q83 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 1871

Comment Dependant on existing local amenities
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section  Q83 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID  1762

Comment  per dwelling
Norman Castleton

Section Q83 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 480

Comment As per the Green Infrastructure Plan
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

Section Q83 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 1206

Comment Open spaces lacking in Lowestoft and market towns and infill has not improved the situation. Green infrastructure important
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q83 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 1679

Comment Yes – adequate open space and play facilities must be provided on all developments.
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q83 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 149

Comment On the basis that the open spaces will be used mainly by those on the development a figure per house seems appropriate. However larger developments should reflect the needs of the community as a whole.
Q83 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the needs of the green infrastructure strategy.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q83 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 1968

Comment No opinion.
Q84 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments.

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section  Q84 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID  2052

Comment  NPFA six acre standard.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q84 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 1763

Comment per 20 homes
Norman Castleton

Section Q84 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 481

Comment The Green Infrastructure Plan has already been breached on the North Denes and the leases to Tingdene. - ongoing dispute. The standard should be as per the Green Infra-structure plan but WDC must be serious about this.
Jonathan Blankley

Section | Q84 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID | 150

Comment | No less than the existing one.
John Norris

Q84 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 1034

Comment no policy can be applied unilaterely without taken existing space into consideration.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q84 Should we continue to set a per dwelling or per hectare standard for recreational open space provision on residential developments. Or, should the Council require the provision of recreational open space on residential developments to be based on the

Comment ID 1969

Comment No opinion.
Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section  Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID  2053

Comment  Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Natalie Beal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 1144

Comment Yes

Areas in Carlton Colville as follows:
The field between Church Lane and Chapel Road that forms a triangle opposite St Peters Church. This openness here preserves the view of the church and helps Carlton Colville maintain its semi rural character.

Green space to the north of Beccles Road. A break between housing and the Carlton Marshes preserves the wild life and open nature of the marshes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes needs more discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr P R and Mrs A Winslade

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 1254

Comment We wish to submit a recommendation that the following area should be considered for designation as Local Green Space. The North Denes from Links Road in the North to Birds Eye in the South, excluding the current Tingdene North Denes Holiday Park.

We consider the area meets the criteria outlined in Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Framework. The area includes the patch of land to the South of the Tingdene development which we understand is being considered as part of the East of England Park but presume that such designation would not conflict with this. It also includes the 2 areas which have been very recently leased to Tingdene, namely the area to the West of the current Tingdene site South of Swimming Pool Road and the area to the North of the current Tingdene site (part of the area also known as Area A in the WDC document, Note on Implementation - North Denes Caravan Site, Lowestoft), North of Swimming Pool Road.

The land is an area of natural beauty (particularly if tidied up), acting as a lovely foreground to the development along the top of North Lowestoft cliffs, part of which is also in the conservation zone. It has considerable historical significance, the southern end in relation to the fishing industry and the northern end having been bequeathed to the people of Lowestoft for recreational use. It is widely used by the Lowestoft community for walking and general leisure and it also acts as a wildlife corridor and is frequently used as a 'resting' place for migrating birds and is very popular with ornithologists.

We, therefore, urge you to give your support to the designation of this area to Local Green Space.
Environment Agency

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 2113

Comment We strongly encourage the designation of green spaces. One of the great challenges facing us today is to improve the sustainability of agriculture and reduce its environmental impact. The depletion of soil organic carbon (SOC) in conventional agricultural fields is now thought to be an important factor constraining productivity as many arable soils have suboptimal concentrations. Good quality soils are essential to maintain sustainable agriculture, and quality high SOC soils have a multitude of benefits. Better protected soils functions can be incorporated into urban planning and policy making could promote more urban own-growing in preference to further intensification of conventional agriculture to meet increasing food demand. Soils in urban spaces have recently been shown to make an important contribution to provision of ecosystem goods and services are an important delivery of flood mitigation, nutrient recycling, water purification, water, nutrient, carbon holding capacity, including carbon sequestration to aid climate regulation. Allotments are a good way to provide urban soils and have also been found to provide additional multi-benefits of; home grown sustainable living, healthy food, nutrient fresh produce, stress relief, psychological well being, physical fitness and cultural aesthetic value. Soil qualities has been found to be consistently higher in allotments than agricultural land across a suite of soil properties and are shown to have more SOC then other non domestic green spaces. In allotments soil quality does not compromised ecosystem services as it does in agricultural use and therefore serves as a multifunctional use with soil comparable to semi natural ecosystem and better than agricultural land.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes and none known of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


John Trew

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 34

Comment Local green spaces are a must and should be large enough to make a difference. Similarly green areas between new and existing housing should be created along with wildlife corridors.
Lesley Beevor

Section
Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID  787

Comment  yes
McGregor

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 1016

Comment I think you should designate areas as not everything can be destroyed for development and profit. There is an area between beccles cemetery and the cycle track that is bursting with biodiversity and a refuge for many plants and animals.
Anne McClarnon

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 707

Comment Yes
Nicky Elliott

Section: Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID: 751

Comment: Yes. I think all existing open green spaces, allotments, parks and play areas within towns and villages in all parts of the District should qualify for this status.
Norman Castleton

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 482

Comment Green Spaces should be identified. Starting with the remaining North Denes and the Parks
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 1680

Comment SCC site for a primary school on Fallowfields, Park Meadows Estate, Oulton. This site was designated for a primary school which is no longer needed by SCC. The parish council feel strongly that this area should accommodate a play area with equipment to serve young and older children, along with an area left to grow naturally to be used by the local community for exercise and dog walking. This is a large site so part of it could be utilised for allotments and recreational use. There is no equipped play area on the estate for children. The parish council received a letter in April 2016 signed by 14 local residents requesting the primary school land be used as a play area. It is currently overgrown and desperately in need of tidying up as it is affecting neighbouring properties.
Paul Douch

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 869

Comment Yes. Cricket field, Station Road, Somerleyton
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 156

Comment Most definitely, the existing sports grounds, meadows at Puddingmore, the sports fields at all the schools. The woods off Rowan Way/Highland Drive. Additionally there should be green belt areas included in any new developments to the South/East of the town to provide a substitute for the any lost fields.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peter Eyres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
john norris

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 1035

Comment yes.beccles common and adjoining open spaces recreational facilities
Rosemary Simpson

Section  Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID  1013

Comment  Yes, at the end of Meadow gardens leading onto London rd. In Beccles, there is access to a wonderfull natural space which has a diverse habitat including hundreds of common spotted orchids early summer, deer and Birdlife. Much joy is had by walkers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes. In Southwold, Tibby's Green and the allotments on Blyth Road footpath.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Q85 Should we identify and designate Local Green Spaces? If so are there any areas which you think would qualify?

Comment ID 1477

Comment We support the provision of high quality green spaces; it should be ensured that long term ecologically beneficial management is secured for such sites. We also agree that Local Green Spaces should be identified in the plan.
Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?

Comment ID
2054

Comment
Yes
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?

Comment ID 1145

Comment yes
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section  Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?

Comment ID  1873

Comment  Not practical in small market towns ie Beccles
CTC John Thompson

Section: Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?

Comment ID: 215

Comment: Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTC John Thompson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Trew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesley Beevor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?

Comment ID 708

Comment Yes
Nicky Elliott

Section Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?

Comment ID 752

Comment Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norman Castleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section  Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?

Comment ID  157

Comment  Yes if it is shown to have a positive impact.
john norris

Section Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?

Comment ID 1036

Comment no
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section Q86 Should we restrict the development of fast food outlets within 400 metres of nurseries, schools and colleges?

Comment ID 1308

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes they can quickly destroy a shopping area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?

Comment ID 1146

Comment yes
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?

Comment ID 1874

Comment Not practical what is the definition of fast food outlet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?

Comment ID 537

Comment Yes. These establishments cause a number of other problems as well as being unhealthy.
Section Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?

Comment ID 789

Comment yes
Anne McClarnon

Section Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?

Comment ID 709

Comment Yes: we have enough already.
Nicky Elliott

Section: Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?

Comment ID: 753

Comment: Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes, particularly in Station Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Douch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?

Comment ID 158

Comment Any new outlets should add to the range on offer, and those providing a healthier option should be encouraged. It should also not be at the expense of the right mix of retail outlets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>john norris</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q87 Within town centres should we restrict the number of fast food outlets in shop frontages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section | Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID | 2056

Comment | Yes
Section Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 351

Comment Development should be required to deliver the recommendations as once lost they cannot be regained & we have lost a huge amount of biodiversity to date & probably cannot afford to lose anymore.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Natalie Beal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong> 1544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> GI Study. Did this cover the entire Waveney district, including the Broads? Are there any recommendations that the Authority should consider as it works up its Local Plan? Can the Authority help in the delivery of the GI Study? On GI, it should be noted that there are early conversations with regards to a Norfolk-wide GI map. The details are being worked up, but if you are interested in understanding more, please let me know and I can put you in touch with the lead officer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 1147

Comment Yes to the highest degree possible. When its gone its gone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTC John Thompson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Trew

Section  Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID  36

Comment  The Green Infrastructure Policy is essential and should be considered in all future development.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 1896

Comment The sites in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, SA1, SA2 and SA3 all have included as part of their proposals the condition to provide, conserve and enhance biodiversity and create linkages between green spaces and wildlife corridors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lesley beevor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne McClarnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 2200

Comment

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

The Plan should set out a strategic approach, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. There should be consideration of geodiversity conservation in terms of any geological sites and features in the wider environment.

A strategic approach for networks of biodiversity should support a similar approach for green infrastructure (outlined below). New development should incorporate opportunities to enhance biodiversity, wherever possible.

Priority habitats, ecological networks and priority and/or legally protected species populations

The Local Plan should be underpinned by up to date environmental evidence, this should include an assessment of existing and potential components of ecological networks working with Local Nature Partnerships, as recommended by paragraph 165 of the NPPF to inform the Sustainability Appraisal, the development constraints of particular sites, to ensure that land of least environment value is chosen for development, and to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is followed.

Priority habitats and species are those listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2006 and UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP). Further information is available here: Habitats and species of principal importance in England. Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) identify the local action needed to deliver UK targets for habitats and species. They also identify targets for other habitats and species of local importance and can provide a useful blueprint for biodiversity enhancement in any particular area.

Protected species are those species protected under domestic or European law. Further information can be found here Standing advice for protected species. Sites containing watercourses, old buildings, significant hedgerows and substantial trees are possible habitats for protected species.

Ecological networks are coherent systems of natural habitats organised across whole landscapes so as to maintain ecological functions. A key principle is to maintain connectivity - to enable free movement and
dispersal of wildlife e.g. badger routes, river corridors for the migration of fish and staging posts for migratory birds.

Where a plan area contains irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland and veteran trees, there should be appropriate policies to ensure their protection. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have produced standing advice on ancient woodland and veteran trees.
Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID: 2201

Comment: Green Infrastructure

Green infrastructure refers to the living network of green spaces, water and other environmental features in both urban and rural areas. It is often used in an urban context to provide multiple benefits including space for recreation, access to nature, flood storage and urban cooling to support climate change mitigation, food production, wildlife habitats and health & well-being improvements provided by trees, rights of way, parks, gardens, road verges, allotments, cemeteries, woodlands, rivers and wetlands. Green infrastructure is also relevant in a rural context, where it might additionally refer to the use of farmland, woodland, wetlands or other natural features to provide services such as flood protection, carbon storage or water purification.

A strategic approach for green infrastructure networks should support a similar approach for ecological networks, as outlined above. Evidence of a strategic approach can be underpinned by Green Infrastructure Strategy. We encourage the provision of green infrastructure to be included within a specific policy in the Local Plan or alternatively integrated into relevant other policies, for example biodiversity, green space, flood risk, climate change, reflecting the multifunctional benefits of green infrastructure.
Nicky Elliott

Section Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 938

Comment Yes.
Norman Castleton

Section Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 485

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Of course it should or what is the point of having a green infrastructure strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul Douch

Section Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 872

Comment Yes
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 159

Comment Yes in every single case.
Peter Eyres

Section Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 1426

Comment Yes, inter-connected networks are essential for wildlife to thrive. It is no use finding excuses why this or that development should be excused from the Green Infrastructure Strategy: these networks have to be treated holistically.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>john norris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 1017

Comment Absolutely YES if these are not upheld developers will ignore in favour of profit.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section  Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID  1973

Comment  Yes.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Q88 Should development be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy with respect to networks of biodiversity?

Comment ID 1478

Comment We consider that development should be required to deliver the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy, in order to improve the green infrastructure provision in the district.
Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section  Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID  2057

Comment  Sufficient to prevent them being lost.
Section Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID 352

Comment Locally designated sites should be given the same level of protection as national or international ones. Local people and organisations know how their local environment ticks better than anyone else.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The highest possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID 1768

Comment as per national policy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>high protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGregor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>High protection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**McGregor**

**Section**  
Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

**Comment ID**  
1228

**Comment**  
High protection. Biodiversity is key in this country and needs space and respect. People will come from other areas to admire our unique specimens and habitats. At the moment this falls short apart from when high lit by organisations such as RSPB, Suffolk and Norfolk wildlife trusts. I would expect my council to have the same viewpoint.
Natural England

Section

Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID 2198

Comment

Designated sites
The Local Plan should set criteria based policies to ensure the protection of designated biodiversity and geological sites. Such policies should clearly distinguish between international, national and local sites. Natural England advises that all relevant Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), European sites (Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protect Areas) and Ramsar sites should be included on the proposals map for the area so they can be clearly identified in the context of proposed development allocations and policies for development. Designated sites should be protected and, where possible, enhanced.

The Local Plan should be screened under Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) at an early stage so that outcomes of the assessment can inform key decision making on strategic options and development sites. It may be necessary to outline avoidance and/or mitigation measures at the plan level, including a clear direction for project level HRA work to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of internationally designated sites. It may also be necessary for plans to provide policies for strategic or cross boundary approaches, particularly in areas where designated sites cover more than one Local Planning Authority boundary.

Natural England would welcome early discussion on the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the plan and can offer further advice as policy options are progressed.
Nicky Elliott

Section  Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID  939

Comment  Exemption from development.
<p>| Norman Castleton |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Section         | Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value? |
| Comment ID      | 486                                             |
| Comment         | The highest possible                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong> 1681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> Where sites are supported by voluntary organisations, support and protection to these organisations to carry out their important role is crucial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pamela Cyprien

Section | Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID | 1274

Comment | As much as possible, especially wildlife corridors.
Paul Douch

Section Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID 873

Comment HIGH – encroachment by development or impact on threatened/rare species should only occur if at least equivalent land area is committed to conservation of biodiversity
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID 160

Comment As high a level of protection as possible, once lost they are gone forever.
Peter Eyres

Section
Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID
1427

Comment
A high level of protection: we are struggling to maintain existing levels of biodiversity, so what we are doing now is not enough. We need to raise the bar.
john norris

Section Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID 1040

Comment full protection until all suitable areas for development are exhausted
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rosemary Simpson</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear

Section Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Comment ID 1310

Comment The strongest possible protection should be given to designated sites of biodiversity value
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Enhanced protection. We also refer you to the Royal Horticultural Society which associates a degrading of biodiversity with the increase in paved gardens. Paving of gardens should be discouraged and landscaping to encourage wildlife, even in small spaces, should be encouraged – both in new development and conversions. See <a href="https://www.rhs.org.uk/science/pdf/climate-and-sustainability/urban-greening/gardening-matters-urban-greening">https://www.rhs.org.uk/science/pdf/climate-and-sustainability/urban-greening/gardening-matters-urban-greening</a>. We urge that this approach be incorporated in the Local Plan and permitted in Neighbourhood Plans. We would like the Local Plan to adopt the approach to tree protection and planting used by the Fortune Green and West Hampstead NP. See Policy 18, P. 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q89 What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>County Wildlife Sites (CWS) should be strongly protected from the impacts of new development as they represent areas which are of at least county value for wildlife (and sometimes of national value). Sites designated as CWS should not be allocated for development of any kind and nor should any unallocated development be allowed on them. Any allocations within close proximity of a CWS should be carefully assessed to ensure that they would not result in any adverse impact on the ecological value of the CWS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Andrew Nainby

Section  Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID  967

Comment  Beccles quay and common
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Landscape character. The next version of the Local Plan should set out how Waveney will consider, protect and enhance the setting of the Broads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong> Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong> 1149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> The Broads including Carlton Marshes, beaches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 218

Comment it is wrong to prioritise. all Waveney's rural area is precious
Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 1329

Comment I am a Reydon resident but much of the 'gap' area around Reydon and Southwold is AONB, important flora and fauna reserves. This is becoming very rare elsewhere and would be very difficult to recover if destroyed or degraded. There are increasing fewer such places.
Emma Batchelor

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 1059

Comment the land on Lowestoft road
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>the current protection of the rural river valley and tributary farmland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 538

Comment The coastal areas and the Waveney valley after which the district is named.
| **John Trew** |  |
| **Section** | Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan? |
| **Comment ID** | 37 |
| **Comment** | Waveney has a great many open spaces with far reaching views which should be retained. |
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 1897

Comment The beach and heath areas on the southern edge of Kessingland were designated an Area of Outstanding Beauty in 1970. This area is also part of the Heritage Coast, with the beach below Kessingland afforded a significant level of environmental protection through its designation as a Special Protection Area (SPA) and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). See response to Q67, Q68, Q69 with regards to protection to rural valleys and tributary farmlands.
Iesley beevor

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 792

Comment retain as at present - there are sufficient other areas available without considering these areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesley beevor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Natural England

Section
Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID
2197

Comment
Landscape
Natural England expects the Plan to include strategic policies to protect and enhance valued landscapes, as well criteria based policies to guide development, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
The plan area includes an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty/National Park. We advise the LPA to take into account the relevant Management Plan for the area. For Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the LPA should seek the views of the AONB Partnership. Development proposals brought forward through the plan should avoid significant impacts on protected landscapes, including those outside the plan’s area and early consideration should be given to the major development tests set out in paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
Nicky Elliott

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 940

Comment Beaches, river valleys, woodlands.
Norman Castleton

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 487

Comment The Broads and all Coastal Areas
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Beccles Common, area around Carlton Nature Reserve. Breaks in village landscapes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 1682

Comment Oulton marshes and Carlton marshes
We should continue to support the important environmental work of the Suffolk Wildlife Trust to preserve the identity and focus of these areas.
Pat Took

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 816

Comment The view across Beccles Common from Lowestoft Road is held very dear by local residents; building new houses on the land immediately adjoining Lowestoft Road would block this view, and should only be allowed as a very last resort.
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 161

Comment The river valley is probably a priority, but given the relative flatness of the area any high structures have a disproportionate effect as they can be seen from greater distances. The area also benefits from distinct villages with their own character and it is important that the existing towns have a distinct border that does not encroach on or absorb those villages.
John Norris

Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 1041

Comment The common land between the Beccles bypass and Lowestoft road and adjoining private land. The current approved development should be the last until all other more suitable areas are exhausted.
Robert Gill

**Section**

Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

**Comment ID**

390

**Comment**

The Waveney area as a whole is outstandingly beautiful with long vistas of sweeping open countryside. These should be protected, not only for the amenity of the local population but also to continue attracting visitors to the area and thus supporting the local economy. Maintaining local farmland and supporting local farmers’ markets is protective of the environment by reducing air miles, and reducing the distance local people need to travel to buy food.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?

Comment ID 1422

Comment 2. Natural Environment

The whole of Southwold and Reydon lies within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. As we have already noted, the Society believes that preservation of the very special landscapes in and around Southwold and Reydon should be of the highest priority. Whilst the AONB receives protection in National planning policy, we believe that it is also important for that protection to be emphasised in the Local Plan.

With the exception of site 142, all of the sites proposed for development in Southwold and Reydon lie on the edge of Reydon and/or in completely open countryside. We comment in more detail on each of those sites in the attached document but as a general principle we consider that there should be little or no development in the open countryside of the AONB.

It is worth noting that the Planning Inspectorate has just refused the appeal by Global Chair against WDC's refusal of an application for a major warehouse adjacent to but outside Reydon physical limits (DC/14/3975/FUL). The Inspector in his decision dated 1 June 2016 said: '"...the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and would not conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. Because AONBs have the highest status of protection in landscape terms I give great weight to that harm.'

We respectfully agree with the Inspector's conclusions and suggest that they should inform the general approach to development in the AONB.
**Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor**

**Section** | Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?
---|---
**Comment ID** | 1975
**Comment** | Rather than ask consultees to identify specific landscapes, it would be better to provide scope in the Local Plan to permit and encourage Neighbourhood Plans to identify landscapes and provide them with extra protection. This is because there are many special landscapes that are best known to local people. We also urge that when new development is designed, it is always required to take account of the character of the landscape and housing should be designed to fit into the landscape. Also, there should be a strong requirement that the landscaping of any new development enhances the quality of the landscape.
**Suffolk County Council James Cutting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q90 What landscapes in Waveney do you think are the most valuable and worthy of protection in the Local Plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Ecology and Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waveney District Council highlights the distinctive landscape of the district acknowledging the importance to enhance and preserve this asset. Suffolk County council welcomes this approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The new Local Plan will need to enhance and protect the district's diverse landscape &amp; ecology amongst others by minimising recreational disturbance to sensitive designated wildlife sites and maximising opportunities to foster and develop a green infrastructure network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part of the land to the North of Lowestoft is, at present, providing Skylark mitigation from two major infrastructure projects in the district and, as a result, any additional development in the area needs to take this into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The county council would welcome a strategic approach to develop the land south of Lowestoft. This will ensure that existing ecology and landscape constraints are identified and necessary protection, mitigation &amp; enhancement measures are developed and implemented as early as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beccles and Worlingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development along the southern relief road is unlikely to be affected by major ecological and biodiversity constraints. The county council also notes a buffer zone between proposed development north of Beccles and the Beccles Marshes is essential for the future protection of the Marshes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southwold and Reydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owing to its location close to the estuary, there is likely to be the need for additional provision on open space and green infrastructure for scale of the proposed development to minimise recreational disturbance of sensitive designated wildlife sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Andrew Nainby

Section
Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 968

Comment Yes
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 2058

Comment Q90 and 91. There is much to value in the landscape of the area but the river valleys are perhaps the strongest part of the identity of the area and should be protected.
brian may

Section  Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID  353

Comment  yes because once lost it cannot be replaced. These areas are what give the district its unique character and are tied in with tourism and biodiversity.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 1153

Comment yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTC John Thompson

Section | Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID | 219

Comment | Yes
Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming

Section Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 2090

Comment The existing Local plan seeks to minimise the impact of development on all landscapes taking into account the findings of the Landscape Character Assessment, and specifically identifies the rural river valley and tributary valley farmland character areas and states that development affecting these landscapes should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding national need for development and that no alternative sites can be found. This is quite an onerous approach and as the Council correctly identifies, gives these landscapes equal status as the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is not appropriate to continue with this approach as it would be found inconsistent with the requirements of paragraph 113 of the Framework which makes clear that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development affecting landscape areas will be judged and distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites so that protection is commensurate with their status and appropriate weight is given to their importance. Development can often be delivered without eroding the sense of separation or resulting in the loss of openness, character or views that are considered to be important. Furthermore, to be considered a valued landscape their must be a demonstrable physical attribute rather than just popularity to demonstrate why development should not be delivered in such a location. This will likely require the Council to update the Landscape Character Assessment to ensure that it provides a practical and robust Framework to inform the decision making process.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Janet Holden

Section  Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID  78

Comment  Yes, this is imperative to maintain the unique character of the area.
Janet Holden

Section Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 81

Comment Yes, this is a unique and important part of the UK and the council should be beholden to look after it for future generations
Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 794

Comment yes
McGregor

Section Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 1231

Comment Yes. All our county needs strong protection. It is not industrial or commercial land.
Nicky Elliott

Section Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 941

Comment Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norman Castleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Cyprien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul Douch

Section Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 874

Comment Yes
## Jonathan Blankley

**Section**  
Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

**Comment ID**  
162

**Comment**  
Yes, unless the development is of a very high environmental standard with a minimal impact on the landscape.
Robert Gill

Section Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 389

Comment Yes
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?

Comment ID 1117

Comment Yes protect this is also a tourist attraction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q91 Should we continue the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We support continuing the strong protection given to rural river valleys and tributary valley farmlands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 2059

Comment
The strategic gaps have served to protect the identity of individual settlements and should be retained to prevent agglomeration. Where such designations do exist, they need to be assessed carefully on the ground. The original designation between Kessingland and Pakefield, for example, do not have a very coherent southern boundary.
Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 354

Comment If at all possible the coalescence of settlements should be avoided to maintain the unique feel of each settlement. The different villages are what gives the area its unique feel and this is tied in closely with quality of life, tourism and biodiversity.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 1151

Comment yes have strategic gaps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTC John Thompson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 1328

Comment I generally agree with this policy. But not to the detriment of other open breaks in the area. Great care needs to be taken in Waveney to prevent the disfigurement resulting from merged settlements elsewhere in England.
Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 2091

Comment Development can often be located in strategic gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss and openness and character. In such circumstances we would question whether the continuation of such an approach is consistent with what is now required by the Framework, particularly if this would prevent development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites being delivered to meet the district’s housing needs.

The recent Court of Appeal Judgment in Richborough Estates Partnership LLP v Cheshire East Borough Council and Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (C1/2015/0894) is informative on the policies relevant to the supply of housing and provides further clarity on the wider interpretation that is now to be placed on §49 of the Framework.

In light of the above, the Council should apply a criteria based policy consistent with the requirements of §14, §49 and §113 of the Framework. This would be a more logical approach consistent with the requirements of national policy rather than a continuation of a policy that seeks to protect vast swaths of land when a large proportion of land within these areas would not actually lead to coalescence if they were to be developed.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 1771

Comment yes keep the gaps
John Eade

Section | Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID | 539

Comment | Both elements are required. The strategic gaps address the major areas of population but the position is equally important for preventing smaller communities joining up and impacting heavily on the environment and nature.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 1898

Comment Both Strategic Gaps and Opens Breaks make an important contribution to the visual amenity and character of the area. Although these are not protected by formal landscape designation. Therefore to prevent coalescence of settlements development should as a general rule not be permitted.

In respect of Kessingland the proposed development sites identified in the Neighbourhood Plan are on the northern boundary of the village. Whilst these sites do narrow the gap between Kessingland and Lowestoft, the previous use of the former Ashley Nurseries site means that principle of development has been established and through sensitive design, its redevelopment would not erode the open character of the Strategic Gap, as well as representing a significant opportunity to redevelop a Brownfield site. With development of the Ashley Nurseries site, the development of land at Laurel Farm would also not prejudice the open character of the Strategic Gap.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lesley Beevor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Louis Smith

Section  Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID  570

Comment  I definitely thing the "Strategic Gaps" should be retained. Many people from Lowestoft and Gorleston visit Lound to feed the ducks and to enjoy the tranquility of the countryside.
| McGregor |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Section**                 | Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements? |
| **Comment ID**              | 1229                                                                             |
| **Comment**                 | I believe these gaps will fill over time but maintain that a nature corridor needs to be built in to allow our native species to thrive despite development. |
Anne McClarnon

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 711

Comment Continue with the status quo and maintain the Strategic Gaps policy.
Nicky Elliott

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 942

Comment Retain the 'Strategic Gaps' listed.
Norman Castleton

**Section**

Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

**Comment ID**

489

**Comment**

Continue present policy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 1683

Comment Yes, we should retain the strategic gaps between all towns and villages.
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 163

Comment The strategic gaps should be maintained.
john norris

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 1042

Comment yes continue with strategic gaps. Behavioural and social problems occur when urban areas get too large with no breaks
### Rosemary Simpson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Keep gaps, apart from good for us it's good for wildlife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 1977

Comment Retain existing strategic gaps, identify more, and enhance all with Local Green Space designation.
St John's Hall Farms
Bidwells (John Long)

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 1395

Comment St John's Hall Farms suggest that a Strategic Gap Policy is not required and is not supported by National Planning Policy.
The Slater Family
Bidwells (John Long)

Section  Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID  2231

Comment  The Slater Family suggest that a Strategic Gap Policy is not required and is not supported by National Planning Policy.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section Q92 Should we continue to identify 'Strategic Gaps' between Lowestoft and Kessingland, Lowestoft and Hopton and Halesworth and Holton? Or should we instead have a more general policy which aims to avoid the coalescence of settlements?

Comment ID 1469

Comment The idea of a new settlement nr Corton knocks this into a tin hat
Q93 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, are there any other gaps between existing settlements which would benefit from a 'Strategic Gap' policy?

Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Comment ID 1152

Comment

Strategic gap between Carlton Colville and Gisleham.
Strategic gap between Carlton Colville and Mutford
Strategic gap between Chapel Road and Church Lane in Carlton Colville
Strategic gap between Beccles Road and Carlton Marshes
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q93 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, are there any other gaps between existing settlements which would benefit from a 'Strategic Gap' policy?

Comment ID 1876

Comment It is desirable but may prove more difficult in the future
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q93 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, are there any other gaps between existing settlements which would benefit from a 'Strategic Gap' policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Kessingland - Blythburgh, blythburgh - Holton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q93 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, are there any other gaps between existing settlements which would benefit from a 'Strategic Gap' policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>not known of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section Q93 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, are there any other gaps between existing settlements which would benefit from a 'Strategic Gap' policy?

Comment ID 540

Comment All communities should be delineated by some form of gap to give a greater sense of community. Where open land can be used for this there are many other benefits.
lesley beevor

Section Q93 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, are there any other gaps between existing settlements which would benefit from a 'Strategic Gap' policy?

Comment ID 796

Comment strategic gap between beccles and worlingham should be retained
McGregor

Section Q93 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, are there any other gaps between existing settlements which would benefit from a 'Strategic Gap' policy?

Comment ID 1230

Comment Beccles and Ringsfield.
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q93 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, are there any other gaps between existing settlements which would benefit from a 'Strategic Gap' policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The open views in Barnby as one enters the village and the gap between North Cove And Barnby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q93 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, are there any other gaps between existing settlements which would benefit from a 'Strategic Gap' policy?

Comment ID 165

Comment Yes between Beccles and the Villages to the South, East and West. Worlingham has already been absorbed, but there is no need for any more villages to suffer the same fate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>john norris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert Gill</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q93 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, are there any other gaps between existing settlements which would benefit from a 'Strategic Gap' policy?

Comment ID 1978

Comment Retain existing strategic gaps, identify more, and enhance all with Local Green Space designation.
Q94 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, should it be a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q94 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, should it be a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID 2060

Comment In the event that Neighbourhood Plans seek development in these areas and those views are endorsed locally, then the Council should take account of that view, as it is a local expression of value – or perhaps lack of it, by residents for the policy. In the event that local residents do not view the strategic gap as having a valid purpose, then should the planning system stand in their way?
**Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers**

**Section**
Q94 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, should it be a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

**Comment ID**
1154

**Comment**
no
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Norman Brooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section
Q94 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, should it be a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID 1773

Comment yes
John Eade

Section

Q94 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, should it be a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?

Comment ID 541

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicky Elliott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Norman Castleton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q94 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, should it be a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q94 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, should it be a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q94 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, should it be a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Blankley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q94 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, should it be a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Norris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q94 If we retain the 'Strategic Gap' policy, should it be a Strategic Policy requiring proposals in Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Adam Hook

Section

Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID

403

Comment

Yes, definitely they all should
Andrew Nainby

**Section**

Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

**Comment ID**

969

**Comment**

Absolutely - the retention of open breaks such as these support wildlife and help maintain the quality of air that makes the Waveney such a great place to live.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 1155

Comment Triangle of land between Chapel Road and Church Lane in Carlton Colville and green belt between Beccles Road and Carlton Marshes in Carlton Colville
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 1878

Comment Yes site 72 on call for sites
CTC John Thompson

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 222

Comment Yes.
Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 1330

Comment Yes and see my other comments.
Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 1057

Comment yes we should continue to keep all the open breaks I live on Lowestoft road and the land has always been seen as a natural break between beccles and worligham.
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section  Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID  372

Comment  Certainly these sites should continue to be identified as 'open breaks'. Lowestoft Road is a classic example of this as can be readily seen when travelling between Beccles and Worlingham.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes and not known of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Eade</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Beccles Common and the surrounding land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Beevor</td>
<td>Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dixon

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 400

Comment Site 72 - This is a natural boundary between Beccles and Worlingham. It is a foodplain. If this is built upon then the capacity for water absorption in the surrounding area is reduced. It is a habitat to wildlife. Lowestoft road is busy enough as it is. An additional 130 homes will result in gridlock all the way to Beccles every morning and evening. The facilities in Beccles can barely keep up with current population demand. The extra influx of inhabitants will overwhelm the town. I am drastically opposed to building on this land and propose that this plan is abandoned immediately.
Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 944

Comment Yes, continue to identify the listed 'Open Breaks'.
Norman Castleton

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 492

Comment Yes and Corton - Hopton Kessingland etc
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 1685

Comment Yes
| **Pat Took** |
| **Section** |
| Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks? |
| **Comment ID** |
| 817 |
| **Comment** |
| I recommend that the gap between Beccles and Worlingham (opposite The Spinney) be designated an Open Break. |
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 167

Comment Thought should be given to areas that would provide breaks between Beccles and its neighbouring villages.
John Norris

**Section**
Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

**Comment ID**
1045

**Comment**
imperative these open breaks are maintained
Robert Gill

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 392

Comment Yes
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 1121

Comment Yes continue open gaps in the affor mentioned ares.
Teresa Cooper

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Ollands Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 409

Comment In line with the Green Infrastructure Strategy we believe that the 'Open break' between Beccles & Worlingham (designated site 72 on Consultation document) should be preserved. This open break provides vital breading and habitat grounds for barn owls and kestrels. On this site we have also seen, foxes and cubs, herons and many other varieties of birds. This wildlife would be lost if this Open break was lost. This open break also provides much needed marshland for surface water to drain to. As residents of Lowestoft road we regularly see (during a downpour) the Lowestoft road looking like a river. Currently water can drain quite naturally down to the marshes. If this land is built on, the water would quite naturally drain into peoples houses! With our property on the Lowestoft road it is clear that water from behind our house (Ellough Road upwards) drains through our land down to this marshland. The Quay already floods, by building housing on other flood plains it will just raise the water levels in these risk areas even more. There are higher areas in Beccles that could be built on. For example extending the housing at Ellough.
Teresa Cooper

Section Q95 Should we continue to identify 'Open Breaks' at Lowestoft Road, Carlton Colville, Dip Farm, Gunton and Olland Plantation and Meadows, Bungay? Are there other area that could be identified as open breaks?

Comment ID 715

Comment In line with the Green Infrastructure Strategy we believe that the 'Open break' between Beccles & Worlingham (designated site 72 on Consultation document) should be preserved.

This open break provides vital breeding and habitat grounds for barn owls and kestrels. On this site we have also seen, foxes and cubs, herons and many other varieties of birds. This wildlife would be lost if this Open break was lost.

This open break also provides much needed marshland for surface water to drain to. As residents of Lowestoft road we regularly see (during a downpour) the Lowestoft road looking like a river. Currently water can drain quite naturally down to the marshes. If this land is built on, the water would quite naturally drain into peoples houses! With our property on the Lowestoft road it is clear that water from behind our house (Ellough Road upwards) drains through our land down to this marshland. The Quay already floods, by building housing on other flood plains it will just raise the water levels in these risk areas even more. There are higher areas in Beccles that could be built on. For example extending the housing at Ellough.
Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Adam Hook

Section  Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID  404

Comment  They are special and should always be protected.
Andrew Nainby

Section  Q96 Are the above ‘Open Breaks’ demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID  970

Comment  Designated as Local Green Spaces to provide the greater protection
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 1156

Comment Yes and include areas 21, 80 and 7
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 1879

Comment Yes
Section Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 1331

Comment Yes
Section Q96 Are the above ‘Open Breaks’ demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 1058

Comment yes Lowestoft road should be designated as a local green space the land is home to a variety of wildlife and prime hunting ground for kestrels and barn owls. the green infrastructure strategy is critical to keep a healthy balance between the housing and wildlife areas
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 373

Comment We can only speak for Lowestoft Road, but this is special to the local community by dint of forming a major part of the view from Beccles common. It is also loved by locals as being an important habitat for kestrels and, more importantly, barn owls.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q96 Are the above ‘Open Breaks’ demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>designate them as local green spaces to protect them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Eade

Section  
Q96 Are the above ‘Open Breaks’ demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID  
543

Comment  
Yes. These areas are all important to their communities and significantly improve the environment. They provide green corridors in accord with the Green Infrastructure Strategy.
Iesley beevor

Section       Q96 Are the above ‘Open Breaks’ demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID   798

Comment       they should be given the highest protection possible
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dixon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Site 72  
In Beccles we have previously adhered to the "Green Infrastructure Strategy". If site 72 is developed then this strategy will be being blatantly ignored. Site 72 should be designated as a local green space immediately and be protected from development. The area's of wildlife around Beccles are what make this a special place to live. Site development will not only degrade our quality of life it will have a detrimental financial impact on house prices adjacent to the proposed site. |
Nicky Elliott

Section  
Q96 Are the above ‘Open Breaks’ demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID  
945

Comment  
Yes.
Norman Castleton

Section Q96 Are the above ‘Open Breaks’ demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 493

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 1686

Comment Yes
Jonathan Blankley

Section Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 168

Comment Most are probably open farmland, but perhaps any future development should include an area designated as an open break for the future.
Section Q96 Are the above ‘Open Breaks’ demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 1046

Comment yes they are special to our quality of life
Robert Gill

Section Q96 Are the above ‘Open Breaks’ demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 393

Comment Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Terence White</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teresa Cooper

Section Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 410

Comment Beccles has very few green areas for the public to enjoy. There are no communal gardens. The only areas are the quay (swamped by holiday makers in the summer) the Puddingmoor play area (swamped by mud and water in the winter) and the common. The area proposed to be built on (Site 72) can very clearly be seen from Beccles common. It will hardly be a relaxing area to enjoy if within a few hundred yards there is mass housing stretching right up to the Lowestoft road.
Teresa Cooper

Section Q96 Are the above 'Open Breaks' demonstrably special to the local community and should they be designated as Local Green Spaces which will give them greater protection?

Comment ID 716

Comment Beccles has very few green areas for the public to enjoy. There are no communal gardens. The only areas are the quay (swamped by holiday makers in the summer) the Puddingmoor play area (swamped by mud and water in the winter) and the common. The area proposed to be built on can very clearly be seen from Beccles common. It will hardly be a relaxing area to enjoy if within a few hundred yards there is mass housing stretching right up to the Lowestoft road.
Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Comment ID 2061

Comment The Saints – this is a remote and relatively undisturbed area not crossed by significant transport links. The settlements are largely un-developed and the Waveney meanders along the northern border. This landscape should be preserved if possible from all forms of unnecessary development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Natalie Beal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Carlton Marshes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTC John Thompson</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Frankly, the whole rural area of Waveney should be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
des o'callaghan

Section Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Comment ID 1332

Comment The 'gap' areas around Reydon and Southwold.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Janet Holden</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Trew

Section Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Comment ID 38

Comment The dark skies south from Ellough and Worlingham are a delight and should be maintained.
Louis Smith

Section Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Comment ID 571

Comment I would suggest Snakes Lane should be considered as an area of tranquility. It is a bridle path that goes from Lound to Ashby Church, and on to Somerleyton village. It is very quiet and peaceful, and is a popular route for walkers. It is especially beautiful at this time of the year with wildflowers growing along the field edges.
LYRA (Lowestoft & Yarmouth Regional Astronomers) Jim Slight

Section Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Comment ID 1788

Comment As the local Amateur Astronomy Society, Dark Skies are of vital importance to us.
We have recently moved our meeting and observing venue to the Parkhill Hotel just on the northern outskirts of the present developed area, with good all-round visibility of the night skies, and views over agricultural land.
We are aware the aim of this consultation period, is to get views from a wide selection of the local inhabitants and interested parties, and as such we cannot object to the Proposed Local Plan 2016-2036, we just seek to reinforce views, we think the plan should encompass, with regards to areas (page 47, 164, 165 & 166) under Question 97, (page 41,)
We have put together extracts from policy documents and other information we feel the Planning Policy and Delivery Team should be aware of, and take into account before finalising the plan.
The following are extracts from The British Astronomical Association with links to the source documents.
The British Astronomical Association (BAA)
About the Commission for Dark Skies
The British Astronomical Association (BAA) is the UK's largest body representing the interests of all those - astronomers and non-astronomers - who appreciate the beauty of the night sky and value it as a natural resource. The starry sky is, unofficially but indubitably, a site of special scientific interest and an area of outstanding natural beauty: if it can be seen.
The Commission for Dark Skies (CfDS) was set up by concerned members of the BAA in 1989, to counter the ever-growing tide of skyglow which has tainted the night sky over Britain since the 1950s. Usually the result of poorly aimed streetlights and floodlights emitting light above the horizontal into the sky, skyglow is nowadays increasingly a result of vastly over-powered, poorly mounted household security lights and literally "over-the-top" sports lighting.
CfDS has grown into a network of over 140 volunteer local officers, and several hundred committed supporters, who work to persuade their local councils and organisations of the benefits of well directed lighting, the
motto being: the right amount of light, and only where needed.

Why is CfDS so keen to highlight the light pollution problem?

These pictures show how the night skies have deteriorated over the last 50 years (photos of Bath)

These 2 pictures (1950 & 2000) show exactly the same view of Bath, a small city in the UK's West Country. Through careless lighting, the night sky is now flooded with the orange glow of street- and floodlights.

Light pollution is a world-wide problem. The good news is that the message from CfDS and the IDA is starting to be more widely accepted, and in some cases the trend is going into reverse as administrations and organisations begin to adopt a more environmentally sensitive approach to lighting and the environment.

Should we put all the lights out? Of course not! We need the right amount of light, directed only where needed. We need light at night for many obvious reasons.

Better lighting saves energy and therefore is environmentally friendly both to the skies, and to the atmosphere through the reduction in power requirements from fossil-fuelled power stations.

Better lighting gives us back something like the dark skies that people enjoyed long ago. The light from the rest of the Universe takes hundreds, thousands or millions of years to reach our eyes. What a pity to lose it on the last millisecond of its journey!

The right amount of light, where it is needed, when it is needed

The Commission for Dark Skies Light Pollution and the Law

The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 now makes light nuisance subject to the same criminal law as noise and smells. It applies to artificial light emitted from premises so as to be prejudicial to health or a nuisance.

Light pollution or nuisance, involves several associated problems: light nuisance (the unwelcome intrusion of light from nearby premises, especially into bedrooms), sky-glow (damage to the night sky environment above), and glare, which causes discomfort and may be a hazard to road users and pedestrians.

After April 2006, all victims may complain to their local Environmental Health Office (at their local council), or take an action themselves in the Magistrate’s Court.

In the case of new developments, the best method of dealing with light pollution is at the
planning stage, pre-empting any light waste by influencing the design of lighting schemes via the planning department of your local council and by aiming at the insertion of lighting clauses in your council's local plan.

Full extract:

CPRE's policy on planning (May 2016)

Good land-use planning is the unsung hero of environmental protection. It can encourage urban regeneration, curb urban sprawl, help slow the growth in road traffic, protect the beauty and tranquillity of the countryside and safeguard wildlife habitats. Effective planning is more important now than ever before with economic pressures and a growing population leading to more development intruding into the countryside. Precious Green Belt land is being eaten away despite a Government commitment to protect it. Proposed new legislation concerning the planning for major infrastructure projects presents a serious challenge to the integrity of the planning system.

http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/policy-guidance-notes/item/2468-cpres-policy-onplanning

CPRE PLANNING CAMPAIGN BRIEFING SERIES item 7: LIGHT POLLUTION (July 2014)

Use the greater recognition of light pollution issues in the NPPF to encourage your local authority to adopt policies to reduce the impact of lighting in the countryside. When local plans are being prepared use consultation and public examination opportunities to raise the issue. Press for inclusion of a specific policy requiring detailed consideration of lighting schemes and impacts in dealing with planning applications. When lobbying the local authority to adopt a general policy on light pollution, suggest they prepare a good practice guidance document. Give examples of such documents and use case illustrations.

http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/housing-and-planning/planning/planning-campaignbriefings/item/3045-planning-campaign-briefing-7-light-pollution

CPRE SHEDDING LIGHT: A survey of local authority approach to lighting in England

http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/countryside/dark-skies/item/download/3497

CPRE A BEAUTIFUL COUNTRYSIDE TO SUSTAIN US ALL (March 2015)
We need to value and protect the countryside for the countless benefits it provides to our health, prosperity and wellbeing.

The next Government should:
* Enhance people’s experience of the countryside, by committing to monitoring rural tranquillity and dark skies and the policies created to improve them.

http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/countryside/item/3888-a-beautiful-countryside-tosustain-us-all-cpre-manifesto-briefing

CPRE – LIGHT POLUTION MAP: East of England
A colour map and a table showing how light pollution has grown in recent years in the East of England.

http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/countryside/dark-skies/item/1985-

Government Legislation: LIGHT POLUTION

NPPF ( National Planning Policy Framework )
The National Planning Policy Framework was published by the UK’s Department of Communities and Local Government on 27th March 2012, consolidating over two dozen previously issued documents called Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG) for use in England.

What the NPPF may mean in practice: Local authorities are advised in paragraph 125 of the NPPF that 'By encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.'

Government Legislation: GREEN BELT
While we do not believe WDC has a designated Green Belt Policy, we believe the spirit of the NPPF section 9 should be considered with regards to the Local Plan

NPPF section 9: PROTECTING GREEN BELT LAND
79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

80. Green Belt serves five purposes:
  ● to check the unrestricted sprawl of large builtup areas;
  ● to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
  ● to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
  ● to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
● to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

81. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land.

82. The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions. If proposing a new Green Belt, local planning authorities should:

● demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate;

● set out whether any major changes in circumstances have made the adoption of this Exceptional measure necessary;

● show what the consequences of the proposal would be for sustainable development;

● demonstrate the necessity for the Green Belt and its consistency with Local Plans for adjoining areas; and

● show how the Green Belt would meet the other objectives of the Framework.

The preceding extracts and supporting documents make it clear it is incumbent on the Planning Policy and Delivery Team to produce robust policies to protect our dark skies.

Examples of light glow in South Lowestoft.

The map below shows a map of the areas that two photos were taken 00:30am on the morning of the 23rd June 2016. Local area street lighting was turned off at midnight. The sky glow in picture 1, is in the direction of the roundabout at the junction of Bloodmoor Road, B1532 and the A12. Picture 2, is from the same direction across Elmtree Road (with it’s new lighting) in the direction of the Rosedale Gardens estate.

Note. Both photographs were taken with exactly the same setting and a 60 second exposure which would be considered average for Astro Photography.

(map of south Lowestoft)

(photo of lighting towards Pakefield)

(photo of lighting towards Rosedale Gardens)

We hope the extracts presented within the submission go some way to
prompting the Planning Policy and Delivery Team, to producing a specific Lighting Policy, for all future developers to be forced to adhere to.

We thank you for your time in reading this submission, and if you would like to discuss any of these points further, we are available for a face to face discussion, regarding Dark Skies.

Please would you keep us informed of the details of the specific Lighting Policies you implement for the development scheme, and in particular those to be observed by the contractors during the construction phase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McGregor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne McClarnon

Section Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Comment ID 712

Comment The marshes around Oulton Broad, and the far Western edges of Oulton Broad and parts of Carlton Colville. We should ensure that light and noise pollution are kept to a minimum if new developments are planned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Tranquillity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Local Plan should identify relevant areas of tranquillity and provide appropriate policy protection to such areas as identified in paragraph 123 of the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tranquillity is an important landscape attribute in certain areas e.g. within National Parks/AONBs, particularly where this is identified as a special quality. The CPRE have mapped areas of tranquillity which are available here and are a helpful source of evidence for the Local Plan and SEA/SA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Comment ID 494

Comment The Broads and Coastal areas plus all Green Spaces including parks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Carlton Nature Reserve should be protected from housing encroachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Southwold/Reydon marshes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Blankley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Around Beccles, the river and Beccles Fen, but few areas outside of these.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Comment ID: 1047

Comment: beccles common and surrounding adjoining land. The areas which have public access to the river
Rosemary Simpson

Section Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Comment ID 1122

Comment The southern southwest area of Beccles to name one. Pakefield cliffs. The quay Beccles, behind st Michael's church Beccles.
**Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear**

**Section**  
Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

**Comment ID**  
1312

**Comment**  
Southwold and Reydon and the surrounding cliffs, beaches and countryside should be considered areas of tranquility
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section  
Q97 Are there any areas of Waveney which could be considered areas of tranquillity?

Comment ID  
1979

Comment  
All of the AONBs and Suffolk Heritage Coast. Our response to 90-91 also applies to this question – give NP’s scope to identify their tranquillity areas.
Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets.

Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets. How could such a strategy support and i

Comment ID 1158

Comment Open land that enhances views of historic buildings should be included as an asset. eg triangle opposite St Peters Church Carlton Colville
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets. How could such a strategy support and i

Comment ID 1881

Comment We must look after and protect our heritage, maintain a list of assets but be flexible to allow some development or renovations if this serves to protect and improve.
Gladman Developments Ltd John Fleming

Section Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets. How could such a strategy support and i

Comment ID 2092

Comment In light of the judgment in FODC v SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [2016] EWHC 421 Admin, Gladman consider that it is necessary for the Council to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in §129 of the Framework. The judgment concerns the interaction between S14 and S134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertake to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with S133, S134 and S135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgment apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about 'development proposals,' a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that "The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking." It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets. How could such a strategy support and i

Comment ID 1900

Comment As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Waveney District has a rich historic environment covering 1,622 listed buildings, 29 Scheduled Ancient Monuments, 16 Conservation Areas and three Historic Parks and Gardens. There are also over 1,400 Locally listed buildings and in excess of 3,500 archaeological records on the Suffolk Heritage Explorer database,. The new Local Plan will be an important factor in the conservation and enhancement of this historic environment. The Historic England Heritage at Risk Register records four heritage assets within Waveney District at the Church of St Margaret, Stoven, Brampton with Stoven (grade II*), two moated sites adjoining All Saints’ Church, All Saints’ and St Nicholas, South Elmham (scheduled monuments), Moat Farmhouse, Shadingfield, Beccles (grade II*), Bungay Castle, Bungay (scheduled monument).

Background Issues
Historic England has published a Good Practice Advice Note on local plans 'The Historic Environment in Local Plans' (GPA 1) and an Advice Note on 'The historic environment and site allocations in local plans' (AN3), which can be found at www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/planning-system/ [http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/planning-system/] <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/planning-system/>. We hope this provides further guidance. At this stage and in formulating a strategy that addresses the historic environment, we would refer you to paragraph 13 of AN1, which deals with a series of issues to consider when formulating a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. Historic England have also produced guidance 'Valuing Places: Good Practice in Conservation Areas' which deals with case studies based around the application of constructive conservation. This can be found at https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/valuing-places/valuing-places-good-practice-conservation-areas.pdf/
We note that the Options Report identifies the Historic environment as a key environmental issue on page 4 and we very much welcome this approach from the outset.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets. How could such a strategy support and i

Comment ID 1904

Comment The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at its paragraph 126 establishes that 'Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats'.

A positive strategy in terms of NPPF paragraphs 9 and 126 is not a passive exercise but requires a plan for the maintenance and use of heritage assets and for the delivery of development including within their setting that will afford appropriate protection for the asset(s) and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

The positive strategy will need to consist of specific policies pertaining to the historic environment as well as a general thread influencing all aspects of the plan at all stages in the development of the plan. As part of a sound conservation strategy policies for local housing, retail and transport, for example, may need to be tailored to achieve the positive improvements in the historic environment that the NPPF expects (NPPF, paragraph 8).

For further guidance in this regard, we would again refer you to 'The Historic Environment in Local Plans Good Practice Advice in Planning 1' published by Historic England and produced in association with the Historic Environment Forum.

We would particularly refer you to paragraphs 10 - 13 which refer to developing a positive strategy. Paragraph 14 refers to the development of strategic policies for the conservation of the historic environment.

Paragraph 15 considers identifying inappropriate development. Paragraph 16 concerns development management policies for the Historic Environment and paragraph 17 relates to site allocations.

With regard to the relationship with Neighbourhood Plans, it is imperative to remember that neighbourhood plans are only required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan (NPPF, paragraph 184). Consequently sustainably managing the historic environment is best achieved by identifying clear strategic policies for heritage, in order to assist those preparing neighbourhood plans (see paragraph 14 and paragraphs 28
- 32 of 'The Historic Environment in Local Plans Good Practice Advice in Planning 1' which give further more detailed advice.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

Section Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets. How could such a strategy support and i

Comment ID 1777

Comment Thought should be given for allowing different uses of historic and listed buildings to help keep them in use and protected.
John Eade

**Section**

Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets. How could such a strategy support and i

**Comment ID**

544

**Comment**

Encouraging development that enhances the history of each area. The docks at Lowestoft are a good example where there is little reference to their history.
Norman Castleton

Section Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets. How could such a strategy support and i

Comment ID 495

Comment All given legal status
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section  
Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets. How could such a strategy support and i

Comment ID  
1313

Comment  
A list of Heritage assets and support for development which protects and enhances assets should be included in the Plan but with flexibility to allow development and improvements which keep the asset in constructive use and thus makes it sustainable.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q98 What could be included in a positive strategy in the local plan for protecting and enhancing Heritage Assets? Examples could include maintaining a list of assets and supporting development which enhances assets. How could such a strategy support and i

Comment ID 1980

Comment Preparation of a list of buildings of local townscape interest. Suffolk Coastal has already drawn up criteria (as has Ipswich) and Historic England have just republished and revised its guidance on Local Lists (downloadable off their website). (They encourage greater community involvement in the face of local authority resource constraints.) Revise any WDC criteria in light of the above documents. For local lists to be effective on appeal (when development proposals are refused) PINS would expect any list to have been the subject of public consultation (including affected owners - for which this might serve an education/appreciation role), and for the list to be formally endorsed by the relevant District Council committee.
Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section  Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID  2062

Comment  Yes otherwise there is little point in the designation.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID 1159

Comment yes
**Councillor Norman Brooks**

**Section**

Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

**Comment ID**

1882

**Comment**

Yes but the materials should be more flexible to reflect energy efficiency, maintenance, cost etc. as we could be in danger of stopping people carrying out essential works because of spiralling costs and regulations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTC John Thompson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID 1905

Comment Yes. Historic England consider that it is imperative that Waveney continues to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials in order that the quality of the built form is not eroded but rather protected and enhanced in Conservation Areas. For further technical guidance in relation to historic buildings, we would refer you to our technical advice pages on our website. These deal specifically with looking after historic buildings and energy efficiency and can be found at https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/.
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Janet Holden

Section Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID 79

Comment Yes otherwise the unique character of conservation areas will be replaced with homogeneous upvc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Eade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesley Beevor

Section Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID 799

Comment yes
McGregor

Section Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID 1000

Comment Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne McClarnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Norman Castleton**

**Section**

Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

**Comment ID**

496

**Comment**

Yes
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID 1687

Comment Yes
Paul Douch

Section Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID 875

Comment Yes
Peter Eyres

Section Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID 1430

Comment Yes. It is very difficult to find good-quality modern timber, so every effort should be made to keep existing windows and doors. The techniques are available now to double-glaze existing sash windows in their existing frames (see the work of Sash Window Preservation Limited, a Norwich company), so this should be the first aim where anyone wishes to upgrade their windows, especially but not only in conservation areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>john norris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID 1314

Comment Yes, but with enough flexibility to allow certain forms of double glazing to improve energy conservation.
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q99 Should we continue to ensure that replacement windows, doors and porches in Conservation Areas are of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials?

Comment ID 1982

Comment With regard to replacement windows, door and porches in CAs of an appropriate design and constructed from suitable materials, reinforce planning policies with advice on why plastic does not work in the long run, alternative materials, and an appeal to enlightened self-interest – original historic features enhance property values -- and the promotion and control of Article 4 Directions suspending permitted development rights via the Management Plan section of Conservation Area Appraisals.
Q100 Are any other controls needed on alterations to buildings within Conservation Areas?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section
Q100 Are any other controls needed on alterations to buildings within Conservation Areas?

Comment ID
2063

Comment
Controls over inappropriate cladding and or painting. Replacement of traditional roofing materials with man-made products.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section Q100 Are any other controls needed on alterations to buildings within Conservation Areas?

Comment ID 1160

Comment alterations should be in keeping with the street scene
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section Q100 Are any other controls needed on alterations to buildings within Conservation Areas?

Comment ID 1883

Comment Needs far more discussion
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  Q100 Are any other controls needed on alterations to buildings within Conservation Areas?

Comment ID  1906

Comment  There may be other controls needed in individual Conservation Areas. The District Council should be informed by the Conservation Area appraisals and local knowledge and seek to identify what matters are most pertinent in each instance.

Consideration should be given to an appropriate strategy with regard to works to heritage assets to address climate change within (but not exclusively within) Conservation Areas. Technical guidance in this regard can be found on our web pages as highlighted above. Waveney should seek to establish a balanced approach between protecting the historic assets and tackling climate change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q100 Are any other controls needed on alterations to buildings within Conservation Areas?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Roofing and external finishes should be in keeping with the character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Elliott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q100 Are any other controls needed on alterations to buildings within Conservation Areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Yes, alterations need to be in keeping with the style of the original building, and in character with other buildings in the vicinity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section  
Q100 Are any other controls needed on alterations to buildings within Conservation Areas?

Comment ID  
498

Comment  
Signs and aerials
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q100 Are any other controls needed on alterations to buildings within Conservation Areas?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Solar panels of appropriate design should be allowed on the front facing roofs in the conservation area and all types of panel should be allowed on roofs not visible from the street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Q100 Are any other controls needed on alterations to buildings within Conservation Areas?

Comment ID 1983

Comment Call a halt to the disfiguration of Lowestoft terraces by unsympathetic changes to individual buildings. If development is proposed for a heritage asset, the opportunity should be used to improve/repair/restore previously damaged significance. Raise the bar for conservation of non-designated heritage assets to ensure that the Conservation policies for both the fronts and backs of heritage assets are strong enough in the Local Plan so that the Council conforms with Paragraph 126 of the NPPF i.e. “Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment,[1] including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:
• the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
• the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
• the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
• opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place. Improve verification requirements to ensure that the heritage assessment is proportionate, focused, and sufficiently detailed; drawings are accurate and to scale, clearly readable, and accurate context models/photographs are provided. Provide an exemplar of a model heritage assessment on your website.
Emphasize the need for a pre-application discussion with the Design and Conservation Officer – sometimes, the DCO is by-passed. We have found her involvement crucial to achieving a good outcome.
For solar panels in heritage assets, ensure adherence to Historic England guidance. Set out the expectation that the Heritage Assessment Statement should show that all other conservation measures have been considered and that the energy efficiency gains from solar panels as opposed to
alternative conservation measures are sufficiently large to constitute a "public benefit" that outweighs any damage to the significance of the heritage asset and its setting.
Q101 What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section | Q101 What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?

Comment ID | 2064

Comment | This extra layer of designation is a nonsense as it comes with no real statutory control and no prospect of grant aid for restoration and yet retention places huge burdens on owners where these buildings have reached the end of their useful life. It has effectively recreated the old grade 3 listed builds which had become discredited in terms of quality. The retention of many of these buildings is not an economic proposition and the designation should be retained only for the very best examples.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Norman Brooks

Section | Q101 What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?

Comment ID | 1884

Comment | Should only be developed and or altered to be sympathetic to its surroundings and street scene
Q101 What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?

Comment ID 1907

Comment

Heritage assets are not only those designated under statutory regimes, but those that may be recognised by the planning authority as having heritage significance. Locally significant buildings, structures, features and gardens of local interest act as landmarks and wayfinders, reinforce local distinctiveness and sense of place, are important to locality by reason of their cultural, architectural and historical contribution and as such should be afforded protection.

To that end, we would recommend a specific policy on local listing including a general presumption in favour of retention of heritage assets. The list itself should be expanded to cover all types of heritage assets. The inclusion of the List in the Plan means that it can be considered as a material consideration.

However, it is important to ensure locally listed building policies do not upstage the policies for Listed buildings and that the appropriate position in the hierarchy is reflected.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that such assets can merit consideration in planning decisions, with the authority taking a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Historic England Advice Note 7 Local - Local Listing: <https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7/> (11 May 2016) provides further advice with respect to Local Listing.

Paragraph 39 of the NPPG (Revision date 6.3.14) states that non-designated heritage assets are identified as having 'a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions'.

Undesignated heritage assets also comprise below ground archaeology for which the local plan should make suitable provision in the policy framework. This is to make sure such remains receive appropriate consideration and protection as part of the development management process commensurate with their significance. Not all nationally significant archaeological remains are scheduled, and archaeological assessment in areas of potential significance should be carried out prior to site allocations or planning permissions being considered.

Paragraph 139 of NPPF states that non-designated heritage assets of
archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets. In this regard, Paragraph 132 of NPPF refers to designated assets and adopts the principle that ‘the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be’. Thus the higher the significance of the heritage asset, the more weight should be given to its preservation and/or enhancement.
**Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q101 What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The local mist should be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Eade</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Q101 What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Areas easily lose any connection with their history. Complete redevelopment of areas is often the cause. Developments should be required to include references to the past uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Q101 What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?

Comment ID 1899

Comment In the context of protecting a rich and varied historic environment, the National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Planning Authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. Not all heritage assets are given protection with Grade Listing; there are other assets which are described as non-heritage assets. These sites as heritage sites are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should be exceptional with a balanced judgement being required, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Kessingland Parish Council together with WDC recently had a appeal by a local developer to demolish and build houses on what was a 400 year old site (Kings Head PH) dismissed by a Planning Inspector. He determined in this case that the site had sufficient heritage interest for it to be considered a non-designated heritage asset.

The new Waveney Local Plan should reflect and provide protection to all heritage assets that WDC have highlighted in their 'Local List' and also protect other buildings in Conservation Areas where they contribute to the architectural or historic interest of the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q101 What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Great protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peter Eyres

Section Q101 What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?

Comment ID 1434

Comment It is no use designating "locally listed" buildings unless the council has a policy for protecting them and is willing to take action where the owner is clearly failing to keep his property in good order. The tragic loss of Briar Clyffe, 8 Gunton Cliff, is a classic example where the owner strung the council along: he couldn't have cared less about the building's deterioration and may even have wanted it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Q101 What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Broadly similar to that given to buildings in conservation areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evidence studies

**Bourne Leisure Ltd (Lichfields)**  
**Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Miss Heslop)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Evidence studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**  
Bourne Leisure agrees with Waveney District Council that the Local Development Framework should be based on "a robust understanding of the needs, constraints and opportunities presented in the district". However, in relation to tourism, the Company considers that the evidence base provided by 'The Sunrise Coast Tourism Strategy 2006-2011' which was prepared in 2006 is outdated. It is considered that in order for the Waveney Local Plan to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) it must consider the most up to date evidence as part of its background work. The research/data used to inform the strategy was completed back in 2003, and the strategy only applies up until 2011. Bourne Leisure therefore considers that the Sunrise Coast Tourism Strategy 2006-2011 does not provide a robust understanding of the tourism needs within the district today. In order to ensure the emerging Local Plan policies in relation to tourism reflect and provide support for the growth and enhancement of Waveney's tourism sector it will be critical for an up to date data set to be taken into account.
Sport England Philip Raiswell

Section: Evidence studies

Comment ID: 1371

Comment: Evidence Base – the evidence base on Page 68 of the document fails to make reference to the completed Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy, both of which should be informing proposed policies in relation to the protection, enhancement and provision of indoor and outdoor sports facilities within the district.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Evidence studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We note that in the Leisure and Retail Needs Survey for Beccles, Worlingham is not included, even though the majority of Ellough Industrial estate is within the boundary of our village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1 Growth scenarios

Wendy Summerfield

Section  Appendix 1 Growth scenarios

Comment ID  270

Comment  None of these are satisfactory as they give a huge percentage of growth in the Beccles area compared to Bungay and Halesworth which have more facilities either in place or planned. Also about 50% of the land in 'Beccles@ is in fact in the independent village of Worlingham which has NO FACILITIES at all. The favoured proposal would be number 1 but with a greater share taken up by the other market towns in Waveney. The road health service and other infrastructure in Beccles cannot cope with the amount of growth suggested.
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK Hannah Lorna Bevins

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

2095

Comment

National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.

National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operates the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customers. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.

National Grid infrastructure within Waveney District Council

Gas Distribution

National Grid has a high number of gas distribution apparatus within the administrative area of Waveney District Council.

This includes:

* Low Pressure (LP) and Medium Pressure (MP) (below 2 bar) Gas Pipes and associated equipment
* Four High Pressure (HP) (above 2 bar) and three Intermediate Pressure Gas Pipelines and associated equipment as listed below:

Pipe Pressure Description

HP 1677 Loden(Stubbs Green) - Sidegate Rd,Hopton
HP 1678 Sidegate Rd, Hopton - Corton
IP 1451z Haddiscoe 7 Bar
IP 69000 Wangford-Southwold
IP 79000 Wissett-Halesworth-Wangford
HP 1680 Wissett Lodge - Saxmundham
HP 1679 Lodden(Stubbs Green) to Wissett Lodge
The first point of contact for all works within the vicinity of gas distribution assets is Plant Protection (plantprotection@nationalgrid.com).
Please note that Gas pipeline diversions may take up to three years, please bear this in mind when engaging with National Grid.
National Grid may have a Deed of Grant Easement for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid easement strip, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement. In the first instance please consider checking with the Land Registry for the development area. If further information is required in relation to an easement please contact Spencer Jefferies, Development Liaison Officer, box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com
Electricity Distribution
UK Power Networks owns and operates the local electricity distribution network in Waveney District Council. Contact details can be found at www.energynetworks.org.uk [http://www.energynetworks.org.uk].
Further Advice
National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. In addition the following publications are available from the National Grid website or by contacting us at the address overleaf:
* National Grid’s commitments when undertaking works in the UK - our stakeholder, community and amenity policy;
* Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations - Requirements for Third Parties; and
* A sense of place - design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines.
* T/SP/SSW22 – Specification for safe working in the vicinity of National Grid high pressure gas pipelines and associated installations – requirements for third parties.
http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=33968
* IGE/SR/18
[http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=33968]
– Safe working practices to ensure the integrity of gas pipelines and associated installations.
* HS(G)47 – Avoiding Danger from Underground Services.
Anglian Water Sue Bull

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 2065

Comment See file - RAG sheet summarising Anglian Water comments on the ease at which AW can serve the growth locations listed [all sites]
Anonymous

Section Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 242

Comment Plan a complete waste of time and money. Ignored when WDC wants to and adhered to when WDC wants to. Employment should come first then infrastructure. Do not build social housing on bogs - insurers not happy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section: Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID: 322

Comment: Key Questions Q5 Are there any areas of land you think are suitable or not suitable for development? Reydon is not suitable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B A Crockford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B A Crockford

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

299

Comment

I attended the Lowestoft presentation [for the Town and Parish Councils] of the above. Your officers, Desi Reed and Jack Green, explained the plan extremely well and listened courteously to valid comments from the floor. Your presenters were at great pains not to stray into the realms of politics. However momentous decisions about increases in population, housing, schools, policing and infrastructure are areas where our politicians should be consulted.

I have done my best to answer your questionnaire. However there are many questions missing from it such as:

Why do we need more people when our country and indeed the world is over populated?

If we must have more people, why close Halesworth hospital?

Why did they demolish Halesworth Middle School?

If we need accommodation for the young or those of lower income, why sell off public utility housing.

Why do we allow so many second 'holiday homes' to destroy our communities and deny locals a chance of a home?
Beccles Society Paul Fletcher

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID
1404

Comment
In addition, at the public consultation in Beccles I discussed with Desi Read the possibility of having follow up consultation meetings in a public forum where the panel sits at the top table and the audience asks questions. The meetings would need to be chaired by a strong independent person to prevent the panel being harassed. However, this type of consultation would prevent much duplication of questioning (even with different answers sometimes given by different staff). It would also allow the more timid audience members to hear the answers to questions which they may be unwilling to ask themselves.
Perhaps you would give some thought to adopting this type of approach when you return at the next stage of the consultation process.
Bourne Leisure Ltd (Lichfields)
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Miss Heslop)

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID
2163

Comment
On behalf of our client Bourne Leisure Ltd., please find below representations on the Waveney Local Plan Options Document and Potential Land for Development Map (April-June 2016), published for consultation until 17 June 2016. We set out below our client’s comments on the Waveney Local Plan Options Document in relation to the evidence base used to inform the emerging Local Plan and responses to questions posed in relation to sections within the Options Document on:

1 Vision for the Plan
2 Infrastructure and Transport
3 Employment
4 Tourism
5 Climate Change
6 Landscape

By way of background to these representations, Bourne Leisure operates more than 50 holiday sites in the form of holiday parks, family entertainment resorts and hotels in Great Britain and is therefore a significant contributor to the national tourist economy, as well as local visitor economies. Within Waveney, Bourne Leisure operates Corton Coastal Village and Gunton Hall Coastal Village.

For Bourne Leisure to continue to attract customers and to respond to changing market conditions, the Company needs to invest regularly in order to provide new and improved facilities and accommodation. For many of the Company’s holiday parks, improvements may necessitate the expansion of sites in order to improve the quality of accommodation, decrease densities, or increase the range of facilities in order to extend the holiday season to provide more of a year-round attraction. As many of Bourne Leisure’s sites nationally are located in rural and/or coastal areas, incorporating or adjacent to environmentally and ecologically sensitive sites, the Company also has significant experience of operating within and adjacent to such locations and takes the need for protection and enhancement fully into account in day to day operations and when drawing up development proposals for sites.
Bourne Leisure Ltd (Lichfields)
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Miss Heslop)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With regard to the 'Employment' section of the Local Plan Options Document, Bourne Leisure considers that the growth of tourism should be recognised explicitly as a key positive feature of Waveney's economy. As tourism makes an extremely valuable contribution to the economy and employment within Waveney, it would be entirely appropriate to make reference to tourism within the 'Employment' section of the emerging Plan. Long-established tourism operators such as Bourne Leisure already employ a significant number of people within the region, both directly and through supporting suppliers. It is critically important that Bourne Leisure's current contribution and future scope for growth are fully recognised and built on, in relation to the approach taken to the role of tourism as well as employment in the Local Plan, when identifying the key issues for the economy and employment opportunities as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>2167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | Tourism  
Bourne Leisure supports the consultation document's recognition that 'tourism is an important sector of the Waveney economy' and the Company considers that this should be fully recognised and built on throughout the emerging Local Plan. |
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 1534

Comment
A very well presented document which is easy to read and follow.
Many issues are similar to those which the Broads Authority are looking into. As the Plan progresses, we would be particularly interested in understanding what is said and what you plan to do to address these issues:
* Providing plots for self-build
* The strategic policies for Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with
* Assets of Community Value
* Protecting non designated heritage assets
* Protecting locally designated sites of biodiversity value.
The evidence base that has been produced or is going to be produced – do these (or will they) cover the entire Broads? This approach is useful for the Broads Authority.
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 1547

Comment

Site allocation maps. Please can all future maps show the Broads Authority Executive Area?
Thank you for sending us a map with the Authority's area marked on. There are many proposed sites near to the Broads. As the allocations are worked up the issue of landscape impact on the Broads and its setting from adjacent sites as well as those near to the area needs to be considered. Any natural features such as trees and hedgerows on the sites can benefit wildlife in the Broads and their importance assessed with the aim of retention on site. Some specific comments follow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Debbie Read</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By chance encounter the 'Call for Sites' consultation, as a preliminary to the preparation of the new Local Plan, has lately become known to residents of Loam Pit Lane, none of whom were notified of this procedure. In my case I find this particularly unsatisfactory as a part of one of the sites is in my ownership. This does seem to be an entirely haphazard 'fishing' process devoid of reference to Adopted Policies or notification of affected parties - an indiscriminate line of enquiry prone to opportunistic and inappropriate suggestions. Superficially, the interactive map suggests the alarming prospect of another two thousand houses in Halesworth, which would utterly overwhelm the road network and town infrastructure. It is also an entirely two dimensional exercise which takes no account of the singular topography and landscape features of the town. There must surely be opportunities to focus development to better effect in the emerging Local Plan. It is understandable that the Local Plan proposals are Lowestoft centred and in this respect they seem constructive and well presented. The strategic objectives for the Market towns are less clearly expressed, particularly in respect of the nature of the additional housing they are required to provide for, which affects the criteria for location of potential development sites. With the diminishing size of households and the need to reduce car dependance, the need is to provide smaller residential units in areas with easy access to shops and amenities - in simple terms the aim should be to repopulate the town centres by building on vacant or under-used sites and encourage displacement of space-consuming activities to more suitable locations. This will sustain and enrich the towns and reduce the sprawl of tract housing consuming productive agricultural land. Halesworth is, at present, a uniquely well contained settlement folded into the Blythe valley and surrounded by undulating agricultural landscape and abundant trees. The aspect of the town from the principal approach down London Road is pleasant seen against the rising open land to the Northeast. Later house building has mainly taken place to the North and West with little impact on the historic core and this remains compact and relatively intact. The town being bisected by the Beck is well endowed with views of trees and parkland and high open ground beyond.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

2162

Comment

Halesworth

There are centrally situated areas ideally suited for residential development which have escaped identification in the 'Call for Sites' procedure. Mysteriously the former Tesco site is one overlooked and this is a substantial area with the potential to include an industrial site to the north. There is a large area of land to the west of site 163 but within the existing town limit where significant residential development would have little adverse impact. A smaller site north of the west end of Old School Lane appears unused and occupied by broken down sheds. There is also an area of open land to the north of the Edgar Sewter Primary school. Together with sites 14, 86 and 163 these central sites would in aggregate comfortably provide the residential allocation for the Plan period.
Environment Agency

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

2117

Comment

Additional information and evidence base

Groundwater and Contaminated Land

Groundwater is a dynamic resource and once contaminated or depleted it takes a long time to recover. All kinds of activities can impact on the quality and quantity of groundwater. These include infrastructure developments, water abstraction, urban diffuse pollution, contaminated land and land management practices.

Contamination in or on land can present risks to the water environment, as well as human health. This can adversely affect or restrict the beneficial use of land, but often development presents the best opportunity to successfully deal with these risks. This Local Plan therefore has a key role to play in facilitating the development of land affected by contamination.

Under the Water Framework Directive groundwater bodies have their own status classification (chemical and quantitative). The status is derived by looking at the need to protect groundwater quality and quantity in its own right, but also the need to protect dependent ecosystems in surface waters. As a co-deliverer of the Water Framework Directive you should ensure their decisions do not cause this status to deteriorate.

The NPPF recognises the importance of dealing with brownfield sites and improving ground and surface waters by remediating land contamination (para 111). It expects planning to enhance the natural and local environment and seek to protect all land from being classified as contaminated under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (para 120).

This Local Plan can help by including policies which reflect your specific resource demands and constraints and understanding how the local communities use their groundwater. We can provide guidance on area groundwater characteristics and important considerations.

Policies that support relevant guidance such as our Groundwater Policy and Principles (GP3) document, CLR11 Model Procedures for Contaminated Land Management and Guiding Principles for Land Contamination would be very beneficial. The GP3 document in particular is key to ensuring proper groundwater protection. Parts 1-3 respectively contain our high-level approach, the technical background to our work and an introduction to the
tools we use. Part 4 sets out the legal framework we work within and the approaches and positions we take to regulate and influence certain activities and issues. Part 5 contains tools available to support assessment of groundwater and contaminated land.

Water Quality

Water is essential for life and livelihoods. It allows the natural environment to flourish, and businesses, agriculture and the economy to grow and prosper. Rivers, lakes, estuaries, coastal areas, wetlands and water under the ground provide many different benefits to society; from supplying drinking water and supporting fisheries to providing an essential resource for business and agriculture, transport routes and a source of recreation that promotes wellbeing. It is critical that this precious resource is managed properly to ensure that the needs of society, economy and wildlife can be met and maintained over the long-term. We would like to see improved and maintained quality of surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters and wetlands. The Water Framework Directive (WFD) sets out the need to protect and improve the water environment in its totality. River Basin Management Plans set out the environment objectives for each surface and ground water body in a River Basin District which it will need to meet to comply with the requirements of the WFD. Therefore, the RBMP will be the main focus for Water quality improvements for Waveney. The purpose of a river basin management plan is to provide a framework for protecting and enhancing the benefits provided by the water environment. To achieve this, and because water and land resources are closely linked, it also informs decisions on land-use planning.

The RBMPs are the over-arching source of information on the water environment and the actions we and others are undertaking. The NPPF states in paragraph 165 that RBMPs should be used as evidence on which to base planning decisions. This promotes the use of “up-to-date information about the natural environment” to inform the action needed to improve biodiversity in your Local Plan. All public bodies, including local authorities are required to "have regard to the River Basin Management Plan and any supplementary plans in exercising their functions". More information on the Water Framework Directive is available on the GOV.UK website at: https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/improving-water-quality/supportingpages/planning-for-better-water.

SFRA review

We are pleased that you are undertaking a review of your SFRA and thank you for involving us in your discussions. As we’ve advised, the SFRA will need to work to the most up to date information available both for the fluvial and tidal flood risk to the district. To this end we will be sharing our
hydraulic models with you however you may want to update these to incorporate the latest climate change guidance on fluvial flood risk (published February 2016).

You should also be aware that we are currently undertaking coastal modelling along the Norfolk & Suffolk coastline. In particular, if there are locations where you need to understand the risk from a defence failure (breach) we may be able to add this into our modelling and provide you with the outputs.

- Sequential Approach

The sequential approach should also be applied within specific sites in order to direct development to the areas of lowest flood risk. If it isn't possible to locate all of the development in Flood Zone 1, then the most vulnerable elements of the development should be located in the lowest risk parts of the site. If the whole site is at high risk (Flood Zone 3), an FRA should assess the flood characteristics across the site and direct development towards those areas where the risk is lowest.

It is important that we help you apply the ST to allocations and incorporate the ST into the wording of policies. The ST should be based on the SFRA and, as well as current flood probability from rivers and the sea, could be widened to take into account future flood risk from climate change and other sources of flooding. The ST is more effective if applied early in the development of the Local Plan so it properly considers the flood risk of the potential draft site allocations (derived from SHLAAs and equivalent employment land assessments). It will mean that some sites are not taken forward and lower risk sites are reconsidered as reasonable alternatives. It should follow a Level 1 SFRA and can mean that you avoid having to do a Level 2 assessment if the proposed allocations have been steered to areas with lowest probability of flooding. This will save you time and money. The ST should be in a publicly available document so it is transparent how you have considered flood risk.

We will be prepared to formally challenge a draft Local Plan allocating land for development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 if it is not informed by a ST based on a Level 2 SFRA. This is a very important stage as a site allocated in the Local Plan would not then have any opportunity to apply the ST at the planning application stage.

- Climate Change

Our guidance 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances' should be used to inform the spatial distribution of growth and the requirements of Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) for individual applications. The National Planning Practice Guidance provides advice on what is considered to be the lifetime of the development in the context of flood
risk and coastal change. The 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances' guidance provides allowances for future sea level rise, wave height and wind speed to help planners, developers and their advisors to understand likely impact of climate change on coastal flood risk. It also provides peak river flow and peak rainfall intensity allowances to help planners understand likely impact of climate change on river and surface water flood risk. For some development types and locations, it is important to assess a range of risk using more than one allowance. Support for this approach would be useful in your local plan, as we will raise objections if it has not been considered.

- Peak river flow
We encourage you to consider a range of allowances for different epochs in the development of SFRAs so that appropriate climate change allowances are adopted to reflect the individual development lifetime and vulnerability. As part of a Level 1 SFRA we recommend you formulate an approach to ensure climate change is considered appropriately so you can take flood risk into account for the lifetime of a development when allocating sites. This will ensure you can take flood risk for the lifetime of developments into consideration when allocating sites.

However if no development sites will be allocated in the fluvial flood zones 2 or 3 then it is not necessary to consider the peak river flow climate change allowances in the level 1 SFRA. The Level 2 SFRA should have enough detail for the exception test to be applied. It should assess the probability of flooding, flood hazard, flood depth, velocity and rate of onset, and put in place appropriate flood risk mitigation measures.

Exceptionally, SFRAs may need to consider the H++ allowances but this will only apply in assessments for developments that are very sensitive to flood risk and with lifetimes beyond the end of the century. For example, infrastructure projects or developments that significantly change existing settlement patterns. This includes urban extensions and new settlements. The high++ allowances are in Environment Agency guidance 'Adapting to climate change - advice for flood and coastal erosion risk management authorities'.

- Modelled Data
Please see map below put together for our meeting at the start of June. The blue areas are in the process of being delivered and areas in orange have been delivered. In terms of our planned new modelling, we are anticipating modelling Blyth next year for delivery early 2018.

(Flood Risk Modelling in Waveney map)
As discussed at our SFRA meeting on 7th June the WEM (Water & Environment Management) Framework is an agreement between the
Environment Agency, consultants and contractors ('suppliers'). It has fixed, best value, commercially efficient terms for the award of contracts to deliver projects, programmes and services for customers across the Environment Agency. This user group includes those promoting the Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) capital programme. The framework is also available for use and, in particular, Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs), as well as other Risk Management Authorities in the Defra family. If this may be of interest to you please let us know and we can direct you to the appropriate Framework Lot Manager.

Water cycles Study (WCS)
Attached are some documents with data for the Waveney Sewage Treatment Works, as requested. A lot of these are descriptive consents (which just say things like 'no visible oil and grease, no solids'). We will endeavour to provide you with additional information about when descriptive needs to become numerical.

As a follow up to the attached documents a works with a descriptive consent should serve a population of no more than 250 people. Working out the population that a descriptive works serves isn't straightforward but should form part of your WCS if you intend to have any more than windfall development in any of the descriptive areas.

We understand that you will be using consultants to produce your WCS and revision of permit related calculations. Due to the amount of technical data that we hold and can provide for flow data (i.e. raw, flow daily mean, Q95) it would be more efficient for your consultants to ask us directly for the data they require. This will enable them to specify exactly what they require and how they want it presented. This will depend to a certain extent whether you wish to examine all 4 growth scenarios in depth, or if you are able to narrow it down before you get to this stage.

We can provide you with further guidance on low flows, high flows and the flow range if needed.

There are 3 gauging stations on the Waveney at Billingford, Ellingham and Needham Mill (although some of the data quality for Ellingham is poor and there are long periods of missing data).

The foul water disposal part of the water cycle study, would require upstream flow information for any sewage works that needed new permits. It would be beneficial to hold progress on this data collection until your consultants are ready for it.

Flow Data Sets
Our datasets can be downloaded instantly from the data-share website and accessed free of charge for non-commercial use via:
Information is regularly added to this dataset so please continue to review it.

Our partner data share site, where you can register to receive data quickly and for a specific area, can be accessed here: http://environment.data.gov.uk/ds/partners/index.jsp#/partners/login.

Finally we have a spatial data catalogue which has a selection of national data to download and can be accessed here: http://environment.data.gov.uk/ds/catalogue/index.jsp#/catalogue

Attached spreadsheets:
> Waveney permit capacity
> Suffolk Coastal headroom
> Waveney District Water Recycling Centres (Sewage Treatment Works)
Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis

Section  Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID  1599

Comment  I was disappointed to only hear of these plans and of the closing date through the grapevine. You should have at least posted these documents to people in the potentially affected areas.
Gill Armstrong

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID
1887

Comment
Too much of this consultation overlaps with other ongoing consultations at the moment, I really feel that the responses will be quite limited as people are already tiring of responding three times to each consultation, as I have been told many times recently.
Greater Norwich Local Plan Team Adam Nicholls

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

1358

Comment

Thank you for consulting the Greater Norwich Local Plan team (Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk councils, working with Norfolk County Council) on the above documents. The GNLP team's response is set out below. Comments have generally been restricted to more strategic issues and questions insofar as they might affect the Greater Norwich area. For the avoidance of doubt, this response must not be treated as the official Norfolk County Council response, as NCC is preparing and submitting its own representations.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID
1908

Comment
There are a total of 173 potential sites for development listed in the Options Report. It is not possible to provide detailed comments on each of these sites in detail at this stage in the consultation process. However, the table [below] specifically highlights sites where there is likely to be a significant impact upon listed buildings, conservation areas, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Parks and Gardens etc., based upon a brief desk based assessment.

We have not considered archaeological issues in this brief, desk based assessment but would refer you to the HER held by Suffolk County Council who should be able to advise in this regard. We have also not identified non-designated assets.

Where no comment has been made for a site this does not mean that heritage assets are not affected. Our advice note, Site Allocations in Local Plans (AN3), should be followed as you assess the sites for the next iteration of the Plan.

In taking these sites forward, we would refer you to Historic England’s Advice Note 3 - site allocations in local plans. The purpose of his guidance is to support all those involved in the Local Plan site allocation process in implementing historic environment legislation, the NPPF and PPG. The guidance sets out 3 stages in the site allocation process:

Stage 1: Evidence Gathering
Stage 2: Site Selection
Stage 3: Site Allocation Policies.

The guidance note also sets out a detailed site selection methodology. We would strongly recommend following the advice in this note which should help in ensuring a sound approach to the historic environment policies and in particular the allocation of sites in the emerging plan.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

If you have any questions with regards to the comments made then please do get back to me. In the meantime we look forward to continuing to work
with you and your colleagues.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section | Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID | 1981

Comment | Site 173 Kessingland Proposed Playing field (not listed in Waveney Options report but shown on map) Proximity to The Ark, grade II listed building to the west. Limited impact given the nature of the proposal for the site (playing field).
John and Barbara Carter

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID
1512

Comment
Key Questions Q5 Are there any areas of land you think are suitable or not suitable for development?
Wherever possible it is important that new homes are built on brown field sites and that village boundaries are not extended.
We strongly believe that allowing the St Felix playing field site to be developed would be detrimental to this AONB and it would set a precedent for the approval of future applications for other parts of St Felix and adjacent areas.
At peak periods (especially in summer time) the A1095 (Halesworth Road) is heavily trafficked and often access from connecting roads is delayed. Any future development of this area would seriously impact on this traffic problem.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

1903

Comment

In respect of site 173 (LOW10) in the WDC Local Plan Proposals, this site has been available to extend the playing field/recreation facilities for some time.

LOW10 forms part of the Neighbourhood Plan Policy proposed for site SA2 and the development of the adjacent land will enable the improvement and expansion of these facilities so that they can provide a modern offer capable of supporting the increased level of the playing field and sports usage. Contributions could also be used to improve the children’s play area so that it is up to a modern ‘Local Equipped Area for Play’ (LEAP standard).
1.1 This representation is made in response to the Options for the New Local Plan consultation on behalf of our client, Larkfleet Homes Norfolk and Suffolk Ltd. The Company is part of the Larkfleet Group, a privately owned housebuilder and developer headquartered in Lincolnshire. Larkfleet have an interest in land west of Ellough Road to the south of Beccles and have undertaken a range of public engagement exercises to gauge opinion of the potential development of the site. The land was identified earlier this year as part of the Call for Sites process (referred to as Site Number 82), but for clarity a site plan has been included as Appendix 1.

1.2 This statement focuses on the key issues raised in the consultation which are most relevant to our client’s position. The statement is structured around the questions raised in the consultation paper and the response form.

1.3 Of most relevance to our client are the issues relating to housing and employment growth, along with the overall strategy for accommodating the future development needs. With regards to housing, an appraisal of the Council’s assessment of housing need (as set out in Waveney Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Objectively Assessed Housing Need Study - Preliminary Report, April 2016) and employment lands need (as set out in the Employment Land Needs Assessment (Final Report – March 2016), has been undertaken by our Strategic Planning and Research Unit (SPRU). The appraisal has been submitted alongside this statement but is referred to at relevant points below.
Lound Parish Council John Burford

Section Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 1662

Comment Lound Parish Council had an extraordinary Parish Council meeting on 3rd May to discuss our reaction to the Waveney Local Plan consultation. This was attended by Parish Councillors and 30 members of the public, a very large turnout for our small village.

Residents were informed that Lound Parish Council has started the process of developing a Neighbourhood Plan, in collaboration with Somerleyton Parish Council. This will set guidelines for the future of the parishes, and in particular what type of development people would like to see, and where it should be located.

Members of the public were encouraged to go onto the Waveney District council web site to register their views on the new Local Plan. Paper consultation comments forms were also distributed to encourage responses from people without internet access.
Marine Management Organisation Stacey Clarke

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

2094

Comment

The MMO will review your document and respond to you directly should a bespoke response be required. If you do not receive a bespoke response from us within your deadline, please consider the following information as the MMO’s formal response.

Response to your consultation

The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are; marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing European grants.

Marine Licensing

Activities taking place below the mean high water mark may require a marine licence [https://www.gov.uk/topic/planning-development/marine-licences] in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009 [http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2009/23/contents] . Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence. You can also apply to the MMO for consent under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in England and parts of Wales. The MMO is also the authority responsible for processing and determining harbour orders in England, and for some ports in Wales, and for granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours. A wildlife licence is also required for activities that that would affect a UK or European protected marine species.

Marine Planning

As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. Marine plans will inform and guide
decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. On 2 April 2014 the East Inshore and Offshore marine plans [http://www.marinemanagement.org.uk/marineplanning/areas/east_plans.htm] were published, becoming a material consideration for public authorities with decision making functions. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans cover the coast and seas from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. For further information on how to apply the East Inshore and Offshore Plans please visit our Marine Information System [http://mis.marinemanagement.org.uk/] . The MMO is currently in the process of developing marine plans for the South Inshore and Offshore Plan Areas and has a requirement to develop plans for the remaining 7 marine plan areas by 2021.

Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. For marine and coastal areas where a marine plan is not currently in place, we advise local authorities to refer to the Marine Policy Statement [http://www.defra.gov.uk/news/2011/03/18/marine-policy-statement/] for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act [http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2009/23/contents] and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise.

Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/marine-planning-a-guide-for-local-authority-planners] and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist [http://www.pas.gov.uk/local-planning/-/journal_content/56/332612/15045/ARTICLE#Soundness] .

Minerals and waste plans and local aggregate assessments
If you are consulting on a mineral/waste plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommend reference to marine aggregates is included and reference to be made to the documents below:

* The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK) construction industry.

* The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply.

* The Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply.

* The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England
2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply.

* The NPPF informed MASS guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine. This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the role that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play – particularly where land based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.
Haycock

Section  Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID  935

Comment  I have put many hours and much thought into my preceding feedback, some of which touches upon these final questions. I regret I am unable to spend more time on this exercise prior to the end of the allowed consultation period. Whilst I congratulate WDC for its putting together this consultation document, I feel, given the enormous scope covered, a further month would have been desirable.
McGregor

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

1095

Comment

You may notice that I have only commented on a few of your questions and my answers are brief at best. This is due to only just being made aware of this consultation document and I do not have time to respond fully before the cut off date.

I wonder how neither my household nor any friends and neighbours are unaware of this exercise considering the impact it may have on our town and families futures? It may seem that people are apathetic from the lack of response but it is purely down to being kept in the dark, and you may have been surprised by the ideas which could have come from proper dialogue.
**Natural England**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Sites of Least Environmental Value  
In accordance with the NPPF, the plan’s development strategy should seek to avoid areas of high environmental value. Natural England expects sufficient evidence to be provided, through the SA and HRA, to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected, e.g. land allocations should avoid designated sites and landscapes and should consider the direct and indirect effects of development on land within the setting of designated landscapes. |
Natural England

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

2202

Comment

Access and Rights of Way

Natural England advises that the Plan should include policies to ensure protection and enhancement of public rights of way and National Trails, as outlined in paragraph 75 of the NPPF. Recognition should be given to the value of rights of way and access to the natural environment in relation to health and wellbeing and links to the wider green infrastructure network. The plan should seek to link existing rights of way where possible, and provides for new access opportunities. The plan should avoid building on open space of public value as outlined in paragraph 74 of the NPPF. The plan should make provision for appropriate quantity and quality of green space to meet identified local needs as outlined in paragraph 73 of the NPPF. Natural England's work on Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) may be of use in assessing current level of accessible natural greenspace and planning improved provision.
Natural England

Section | Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID | 2203

Comment | Soils

The Local Plan should give appropriate weight to the roles performed by the area's soils. These should be valued as a finite multi-functional resource which underpins our wellbeing and prosperity. Decisions about development should take full account of the impact on soils, their intrinsic character and the sustainability of the many ecosystem services they deliver.

The plan should safeguard the long term capability of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification) as a resource for the future in line with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 112 to safeguard 'best and most versatile' agricultural land.
Natural England

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID
2205

Comment
Air pollution
We would expect the plan to address the impacts of air quality on the natural environment. In particular, it should address the traffic impacts associated with new development, particularly where this impacts on European sites and SSSIs. The environmental assessment of the plan (SA and HRA) should also consider any detrimental impacts on the natural environment, and suggest appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures where applicable.

Natural England advises that one of the main issues which should be considered in the plan and the SA/HRA are proposals which are likely to generate additional nitrogen emissions as a result of increased traffic generation, which can be damaging to the natural environment. The effects on local roads in the vicinity of any proposed development on nearby designated nature conservation sites (including increased traffic, construction of new roads, and upgrading of existing roads), and the impacts on vulnerable sites from air quality effects on the wider road network in the area (a greater distance away from the development) can be assessed using traffic projections and the 200m distance criterion followed by local Air Quality modelling where required. We consider that the designated sites at risk from local impacts are those within 200m of a road with increased traffic, which feature habitats that are vulnerable to nitrogen deposition/acidification. APIS provides a searchable database and information on pollutants and their impacts on habitats and species.
Natural England

Section | Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID | 2207

Comment | Water Quality and Resources and Flood Risk Management
Natural England expects the Plan to consider the strategic impacts on water quality and resources as outlined in paragraph 156 of the NPPF. We would also expect the plan to address flood risk management in line with the paragraphs 100-104 of the NPPF.
The Local Plan should be based on an up to date evidence base on the water environment and as such the relevant River Basin Management Plans should inform the development proposed in the Local Plan. These Plans (available here) implement the EU Water Framework Directive and outline the main issues for the water environment and the actions needed to tackle them. Local Planning Authorities must in exercising their functions, have regard to these plans.
The Local Plan should contain policies which protect habitats from water related impacts and where appropriate seek enhancement. Priority for enhancements should be focussed on N2K sites, SSSIs and local sites which contribute to a wider ecological network.
Plans should positively contribute to reducing flood risk by working with natural processes and where possible use Green Infrastructure policies and the provision of SUDs to achieve this.
Natural England

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID
2208

Comment
Climate change adaptation
The Local Plan should consider climate change adaption and recognise the role of the natural environment to deliver measures to reduce the effects of climate change, for example tree planting to moderate heat island effects. In addition factors which may lead to exacerbate climate change (through more greenhouse gases) should be avoided (e.g. pollution, habitat fragmentation, loss of biodiversity) and the natural environment's resilience to change should be protected. Green Infrastructure and resilient ecological networks play an important role in aiding climate change adaptation. Coastal adaptation can also play an important role in climate change adaptation.
Natural England

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 2209

Comment
Appendix:
Sources of local plan evidence on the natural environment
The following sources of evidence may be useful in ensuring local plans are evidence based, in line with paragraph 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and assist in meeting Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) requirements. A range of additional locally specific evidence is also likely to be needed to underpin plan preparation.

General natural environmental evidence
National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan.
Natural England has also published downloadable natural capital maps. These are a suite of ten maps, of different aspects of natural capital, contributes to our understanding of where our natural capital is.
The Magic website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area in downloadable GIS format. Specific data sets are listed under the environmental topics below.
Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment, principally ecological.
The following local organizations may also hold environmental information where applicable: Local Nature Partnerships, Wildlife trusts, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and Nature Improvement Areas.
Evidence relating to the significant environmental effects of the current local plan should be available (in line with SEA legislation), as should suitable biodiversity evidence for any plan adopted after the NPPF came into effect (27 March 2012), usually through the current plan's Annual Monitoring Report.

Landscape
The Magic website provides data on the extent of protected landscapes (National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty).
National Park/Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plans may also be a source of useful evidence. These are usually found on these organisations websites.
Most areas have local landscape character assessments. These are tools to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area.

Data on tranquillity is held by CPRE.

Biodiversity and geodiversity

The most relevant layers on Magic for you to consider are Ancient Woodland, Local Nature Reserves, Priority Habitat Inventory, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones), Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, and Ramsar Sites (including, where relevant, marine designations).

You may also wish to draw on more detailed information on specific Sites of Special Scientific Interest and the Conservation Objectives and Site Improvement Plans for Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas.

Priority habitats and species are those listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2006 and UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP). Larger areas of priority habitat will usually be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest on the Magic website or as Local Wildlife Sites or Local Geological Sites. Local wildlife site data is usually held by local planning authorities themselves as is local geological site data.

Local Environmental Record Centres and local wildlife and geoconservation groups are also a source of information on Local Sites.

Natural England maintains the Open Mosaic Habitat on Previously Developed Land Inventory (a priority habitat dataset currently not integrated into the Priority Habitat Inventory on Magic) and is available on request from Natural England via email; NaturalEnglandGiDataManagers@naturalengland.org.uk.

Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) identify the local action needed to deliver UK targets for habitats and species. They also identify targets for other habitats and species of local importance and can provide a useful blueprint for biodiversity enhancement in any particular area. Local Geodiversity Action Plans (LGAPS) identify agreed local action for geodiversity, a list of active LGAPS can be found at UK Geodiversity Action Plan (http://www.ukgap.org.uk/getting-involved/lgaps.aspx).

Some areas have identified Biodiversity Opportunity Areas or similar for spatially targeting biodiversity restoration work.

Protected species are those species protected under domestic or European law. Local environmental record centres are likely to hold much of the available data on such species.

APIS holds data on air pollution in particular in relation to protected nature
conservation sites.

Access
The Magic website holds the following access related data: National Trails, Public Rights of Way (on the Ordnance Survey base map), Open Access Land (the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 layer), together with national and local nature reserves, country parks and the England Coast Path. Locally held data will include the definitive Public Rights of Way, and may include Rights of Way Improvement Plans where they exist, and any locally mapped open space audits or assessments.

Natural England’s work on Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt) may be of use in assessing current level of accessible natural greenspace and planning improved provision.

Green infrastructure
Green infrastructure strategies may comprise or contain useful evidence sources where they exist.

Soils
A provisional Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) map is on Magic, and the GIS layer ‘Likelihood of Best and Most Versatile Land’ is available on request from Natural England via email; NaturalEnglandGIDataManagers@naturalengland.org.uk. Some areas already have detailed ALC maps. The coverage of existing detailed MAFF post 1988 ALC surveys is shown on Magic. The MAFF post 1988 ALC survey reports and maps themselves are available from Natural England or from Gov.UK. Our publication Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land may also be of help.

General mapped information on soil types and Agricultural Land Classification is available (under ‘landscape’) on the Magic website and also from the LandIS website, which contains more information about obtaining soil data.

Climate change
The Climate Change Adaptation Manual provides evidence to support nature conservation in a changing climate.

The National Biodiversity Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment Model provides a spatially explicit assessment of the relative vulnerability of priority habitats. The data files can be accessed here: National Biodiversity Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment data.

The LWEC Climate Change Impacts Report Cards present the latest evidence on how climate change is affecting different aspects of our environment, economy and society.

Coastal and Marine issues
The following may be of help: Catchment flood management plans (considers all types of inland flooding, from rivers, groundwater, surface water and tidal flooding). Shoreline management plans (considers flooding from the sea). Any estuary or harbour management plans that are held locally. River basin management plans (covers entire river systems, including river, lake, groundwater, estuarine and coastal water bodies). Coastal Erosion Maps. The Marine Management Organisation has a marine planning evidence base which supplies a range of information on marine planning. There may be specific Heritage Coast information held locally, such as a management plan.

Water Quality and Resources and Flood Risk Management

The Planning Practice Guidance provides guidance on information sources for the water environment.
Norfolk County Council Laura Waters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>At this stage it is not considered that the Plan raises any strategic cross-boundary issues with Norfolk County Council and Norfolk Council will expect to work closely with adjoining authorities on the delivery of major infrastructure. Obviously you would consult the County Council when you review your Local Plan. Comments have been made by our economic development team on the employment section (attached). I assume, under your statutory duty to co-operate (Localism Act 2011), that if you feel there are any strategic cross boundary issues arising or likely to arise that you would seek further discussion with Norfolk County Council i.e. through myself as the first point of contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Norman Castleton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>I would like to think that any plans and controls agreed will be adhered to by WDC and there will be no repeat of the disgraceful breach of previous policy as per the North Denes which had been defined as an open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section | Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID | 572

Comment | Overall this strikes me as being the beginnings of a plan for an unsustainable future. I would be enthusiastic if we were to start with the premise that current ideas of growth based on a stretched economy, more and more road building and building on more and more land cannot be continued. Therefore e.g. higher building in centres with environmentally friendly constructions and energy use or environmentally viable alternatives should be at the fore-font of current thinking. The whole exercise should be based on a viable future.
Norman Castleton

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

2218

Comment

Suggested site for future development:

Site address
Car parks on the North Quay Retail Park and in the town centre opposite the Library, Clapham Road.

If there are other owners of this site, please provide contact details:
Owners probably the council and the business park businesses.

Current use
Car parks which could accommodate development for residential use on a first floor level and higher

What are you proposing:
Housing

Please provide further details on your proposal:
Density of accommodation will depend on physical possibilities but the areas realised could provide plenty of living space. Transport needs would be limited for the residents.

Are there any abnormal costs associated with bringing forward this site?
Building on stilts at first floor level and above

Please provide details of any abnormal costs associated with bring forward this site:
No abnormal costs apart from agreement with the land owners.

Additional Comments
By building over these car parks extra accommodation within the towns perimeters can be achieved. Building on stilts will also eliminate any flooding risk and reduce the need to develop green field sites on the edges of the town. Transport need will also be reduced when compared with out of towns or edge of town sites.
Norman Castleton

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID: 2219

Comment:
Suggested site for future development:
Site address
Central carpark Clapham Road, Car Parks on North Quay Trading estate.
What are you proposing:
Housing
Are there any abnormal costs associated with bringing forward this site?
The sites will have to be piled to accommodate the living spaces above the car parks
Please provide details of any abnormal costs associated with bring forward this site:
Additional construction costs of providing a building floor above the car parks spaces
Additional Comments
Many of the large car parks are not fully utilized and in cost terms probably cannot justify their existence apart from convenience and as a service to other businesses and services in the town. Utilization of the space above the carparks will concentrate extra development/building within the towns existing perimeters reduce the need to develop green field sites and help reduce the need to provide extra transport services.
Norman Castleton

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

2220

Comment

Suggested site for future development:
Site address
South Quay Lowestoft car parks in front of Asda, the furniture store and the SCC & WDC offices. Build flats or apartments on stilts above car parks. This will maximise the use of central town space, will ensure the accommodation is free from flooding and reduce the need to build on green field sites on the edge of existing developments.
What are you proposing:
Housing
Additional Comments
There is a need to build upward to avoid spreading developments onto more and more green fields.
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID: 818

Comment: Apart from my above comments, I have tried to answer some of the specific questions in the body of the consultation document, but found difficulty in identifying questions which covered my objections to the proposals. Also, the system of having to submit each comment before going on to the next seems very cumbersome, time consuming and "user unfriendly" - not the best way to obtain an accurate reflection of local opinions; I feel that many people will simply give up and not submit their views at all.
Rosemary Simpson

Section  Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID  1008

Comment  You're websites is quite complex may
You're websites is very complex and I only heard of this on the 13.6.16. None of
my neighbours know about the plans. The complexity of commenting may
put people off if they haven't got hours to spare to navigate the website.
But rest assured everyone I've spoken to is concerned and I interested.
Simon Clack

Section Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 1651

Comment Finally, the existing system for informing residents of major planning issues in the Waveney area does not work. I have spoken to numerous friends and acquaintances in Reydon who had absolutely no idea about the new Local Plan and the accompanying consultation process. The best solution would be to send a letter or information pack to every household in the area. This process could be funded by a levy on all the landowners who have put forward their land for development.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID
1431

Comment
7. Preventing or Discouraging Overdevelopment
We believe that protection is needed for the smaller residential properties in Southwold and Reydon so that they are not easily bought and extended. This will ensure the supply of smaller properties which are both needed and would be affordable by local families ineligible for affordable housing and will help to limit the increase in the numbers of residents and visitors staying in Southwold at any one time, bringing with them their cars and exacerbating the parking problems. This could be addressed by clear policies to tighten the definition of overdevelopment, to prevent further building in gardens/courtyards at the back of existing properties, at least in the central area of Southwold, and strong provision for any additional parking that may arise from extensions where these are permitted.
### Sport England Philip Raiswell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Potential Sites for Development – no existing playing fields should be allocated for development unless replacement provision of equivalent quantity, quality and accessibility is provided. As existing use of proposed sites is not listed within the table on Pages 59-67, so it is impossible to be certain which sites might be existing playing fields or other sports facilities. Sport England would advise that the next stage of the process should identify existing uses of potential development sites in order to assist the consultation process for statutory consultees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### St James South Elmham Parish Meeting Mary Henry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Key Questions Q5 Are there any areas of land you think are suitable or not suitable for development? These would include all areas at risk of or prone to flooding for whatever reason and areas isolated from the transport and service infrastructure essential for their proper development and inhabitation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
St John's Hall Farms
Bidwells (John Long)

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

1378

Comment

Bidwells have been instructed by St John's Hall Farms to submit a response to the Council's New Waveney Local Plan consultation. St John's Hall Farms have previously registered their land (East of St John's Road, Bungay), with the Council as part of the 'Call for Sites'. The site has been given the reference: Site 45.

The Council's Consultation document "Options for the New Waveney Local Plan (April 2016)" has been reviewed and St John's Hall Farm have a number of comments to make on certain consultation questions. The response is contained on the Council's pro-forma which is attached to this document. Please note, that St John's Hall Farms do not wish, at this stage, to provide a response to each and every question in the Council's Consultation document and have focused on those questions with most relevance to the promotion of their land at Bungay. St John's Hall Farms reserve the right to provide a response to other questions in the consultation, where they are relevant to their other land and business interests elsewhere in the District.

In Summary, the key points St John's Hall Farms wish to make are:
- Concerning the growth scenarios proposed in the document;
- The distribution strategy of growth and land options;
- Settlement links;
- Housing types and mix,
- Affordable housing;
- Starter homes;
- Design;
- Density.
Stephen Read

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID
250

Comment
Key Questions Q5 Are there any area of land you think are suitable or not suitable for development? Floodplains and highly visible areas.
Stephen Read

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 254

Comment
Key Questions Q9 Do you have any other comments about future development in Waveney and what a new Local Plan should contain? Consultation with residents in each locality is imperative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffolk County Council James Cutting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**                        | Local Economy  
The interrelationship between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth will be a significant influence on the local economy and, therefore, the development of the options. This will be particularly relevant to the phasing of development to the North of Lowestoft. The Enterprise Zone is an important tool for economic development and will need to be factored into the next stage of the document's preparation. The county council will continue to work alongside Waveney District Council in forming the plans and projects that support economic growth. |
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Section Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 2175

Comment Archaeology
Suffolk Archaeological Service has reviewed the document, including the sites identified. Comments and information on all sites included in consultation document are set out in the attached table (appendix 1). This is an initial assessment with a Red, Amber or Green summary to provide a guide and to assist Waveney District Council. The county council would welcome any feedback from the District Council on whether this is an appropriate level of detail at this stage. For the majority of the sites included in the document, evaluation is recommended at an early stage in the design process and prior to the determination of any planning application.

The evaluation process comprises various stages, often drawing from evidence from a desk-based assessment, of non-intrusive (e.g. metal detection) and/or intrusive (e.g. trial trenching) fieldwork to provide greater certainty on the presence or absence of archaeological features and their significance (such as local, national or international importance). This allows development to include localised preservation in situ of significant remains, and for the requirements for archaeological mitigation to be understood and strategies designed at an early stage.

The following is a guide to the stages in the evaluation process:
– Consultation with SCCAS/Historic Environment Record;
– Desk-based Assessment;
– Metal detecting and field-walking survey;
– Geophysical Investigation;
– Evaluation trial trenching (usually trenching amounting to 5% of the area), and/or
– Palaeo-environmental assessment (if necessary).

The resultant evaluation will inform the necessary archaeological mitigation strategy, which will comprise one or more of:
– preservation in situ of significant remains;
– archaeological excavation;
– monitoring of contractor’s groundworks and archaeological recording, and
– archiving, dissemination and public outreach.
The Red/Amber/Green approach is provided to guide consideration about the stages required in the delivery of sites rather than identifying archaeology as a barrier to development. However, it is difficult to comment fully on deliverability without evaluation of sites and there are always underlying risks (in allocation of sites and the production of development briefs for example) without proportionate evaluation (e.g. desk based, geophysical and/or trench evaluation). Although the significance of other sites and the potential for encountering assets that may require preservation in situ is not lessened, those highlighted as Red or Red/Amber have particular known considerations at this stage.

The county council would encourage reference to the archaeological potential in all the site summaries for sites taken forward in the Local Plan, particularly as it alerts developers to the need for any considerations in design, cost and timescale. The County Archaeological service, as advisors to Waveney District Council, would be happy to discuss levels of evaluation and appropriate stages for these to be undertaken.

The consultation document poses questions about the protection of designated and non-designated heritage assets (Q98 & Q101). Given the importance of the Local Plan and the likely significance of archaeological features in the district, a positive policy confirming support for layouts and designs that have assessed and taken into account archaeological features would be welcome.

Attached:

Appendix 1 Initial Archaeological Assessment
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Section
Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID
2177

Comment
Health, Wellbeing and Social Care
The section on healthy communities and the focus on the Health and Wellbeing Strategy is a very positive approach to integrating the linkages between spatial planning and health. The focus on recreational open space, local green spaces and diet are particularly relevant to the district as rates of adult obesity and children with excess weight (reception) are significantly worse than the National average. The prevalence of smoking is also higher than the national average.

The priorities in Waveney include ensuring more children are at a healthy weight, preventing early death from cardiovascular disease, and reducing smoking levels in routine and manual workers. Whilst deprivation across the district is lower than average, there are pockets of higher deprivation such as in the centre and north Lowestoft, along the coastline (south Lowestoft, Kessingland and Wrentham) and South Beccles.

The Public Heath team within the county council would welcome an ongoing dialogue to address these points, to identify key areas and develop appropriate policy responses. This could, for example, reinforce the importance of opportunities for the environments in Lowestoft to encourage physical activity.
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 2179

Comment Public Rights of Way

By working together, Suffolk’s authorities can ensure that opportunities to protect and promote the public rights of way network are realised, in support of sustainable transport, public health and tourism development objectives.

The relationship of rights of way to tourism, sustainable transport, recreation and exercise could be explored further as the Local Plan is developed. This could include improving and reinforcing overall connectivity for these functions.

New developments offer an opportunity to integrate on site networks and recreational open space with the wider network of walking and cycling routes, including access to the wider countryside. This approach would encourage the choice of walking or cycling rather than using the car, delivering both physical and mental health benefits long-term.

The county council would be pleased to provide information relating to the public rights of network where it may be affected by proposed development or opens up new opportunities to foster healthy communities.
Minerals

The Suffolk Mineral Core Strategy (2008) is a Local Development Document and designates areas as Minerals Consultation Areas based on geological information. For some larger developments, the potential exists to investigate and assess the viability of extracting mineral resources prior to the development. Prior extraction assists in providing some of the mineral required to achieve the development concerned and, being in close proximity to the development, it reduces the transport impacts and offsets development costs. The County council would encourage developers to consider the potential for prior extraction, by undertaking borehole testing, as a means of reducing the transport impacts of construction.

The following are minerals sites within Waveney (including aggregate handling and recycling), the operation of which is safeguarded:

– Blyth River Pit, Wenhaston
– Common Covert, Wangford
– Henham Park, Henham
– Flixton Quarry, Flixton
– Flixton Park Quarry, Bungay
– North Quay & Hamilton Dock, Lowestoft


Waste

The National Planning Policy Framework notes that the minimisation of waste is part of the environmental role of planning. The Suffolk Waste Core Strategy (2011), which forms part of the development plan for this area, includes Policy WDM17 which requires that development minimises waste and to facilitate the sorting of waste and promotion of recycling. For larger schemes, there is an opportunity to consider waste management as part of forming more sustainable communities and reducing the distance needed to transport waste.

Within Waveney, there are several waste management facilities, including scrapyards, that form important parts of the waste management process. These operations are safeguarded by policy WDM1 of the Waste Core.
Strategy.
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID

2183

Comment

Waste Provision

The District Council might also consider whether, in their view as the Waste Collection Authority, it would be justified to require that sites include on-site communal recycling facilities ('bring sites').

Suffolk Coastal is served by Household Waste Recycling Centres at Leiston and Foxhall. The county council will identify what provision will need to be made to serve this population growth in the area and develop projects to meet demand. Under the current system, the Community Infrastructure Levy is likely to be a source of funds for this purpose.
### Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment  | Potential Development Sites

We have not specifically assessed each proposed allocation site for the known or likely presence of protected and/or UK/Suffolk Priority species or UK/Suffolk Priority habitats. Existing information (such as that available from Suffolk Biological Records Centre) and best practice standards and guidelines should be used to determine the likely presence of such species and habitats and inform whether further assessment is required, either prior to allocation of the site or prior to the determination of any planning application.

Whilst in our responses on specific settlements (below) we have identified a number of sites that we consider should not be allocated for development, this does not mean that sites we have not listed are of no value for wildlife. They may support protected and/or UK/Suffolk Priority species or habitats and therefore the above methodology should be applied.

Any policies allocating sites for development should also secure significant ecological enhancements as part of the development. Such measures are likely to be site specific, however they could include (but not be limited to) the creation of new nesting opportunities for birds such as swifts; the creation of new roosting opportunities for bats and the creation of habitat enhancements for hedgehogs.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section

Please use the box below to provide us with any other comments you have.

Comment ID 1481

Comment

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)
Waveney district contains and borders a number of sites designated for their international nature conservation value, including those designated as Special Protection Areas (SPA); Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar sites. The Local Plan must therefore be subject to Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) under the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) (as amended), to ensure that any significant adverse effects which could result from the implementation of the plan are identified and avoided or mitigated.
## Potential land for development 1 - 19-21 Ravensmere, Beccles

**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 1 - 19-21 Ravensmere, Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>In Beccles Conservation Area and Grade II 18 Northgate immediately to the west. Potential impact on Conservation Area and setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 2 - Allotment land, Somerleyton

Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council S H Read

Section | Potential land for development 2 - Allotment land, Somerleyton
Comment ID | 692
Comment | This site is not suitable for housing development because it would result in the loss of a valuable amenity, it breaches national planning guidance and the site is in a Special Landscape Area and also the village Conservation Area.
**Section**
Potential land for development 2 - Allotment land, Somerleyton

**Comment ID**
922

**Comment**
Site 2 on the plan area the village allotments (much prized and fully utilised) and site 135 is the playing field, again, a very valued community asset. Neither should be considered for development.
Gerda Gibbs

Section  
Potential land for development 2 - Allotment land, Somerleyton

Comment ID  416

Comment  
The allotment land in Somerleyton is in full use by many enthusiastic gardeners. It is supported by a newly founded gardening group and is an invaluable hobby for the many users of this amenity. There is only limited access via very small lane leading off from the historic Somerleyton Village Green. Any development will infringe on the beautiful historic Village Green. It is not suitable for further developments.
### Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 2 - Allotment land, Somerleyton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Located within the Conservation Area, close to Somerleyton Park Historic Parks and Gardens and proximity to The Rosery and adjacent to a plethora of buildings and other historic assets around The Green including the village pump, The Old Farmhouse, County Primary School and a number of dwellings, all grade II listed. Potential impact upon Conservation Area, Historic Park and Garden and setting of Listed Buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Lavery

Potential land for development 2 - Allotment land, Somerleyton

Comment ID 77

Comment
THIS IS A GENERAL COMMENT!! I was obliged to choose a site!! These comments refer to ALL proposed developments!!!!!!
I will address individual sites that interest me later. We have a severe lack of infrastructure in North Suffolk especially GP access, Schools, Hospitals, as well as car parking, shopping, internet in Halesworth, Beccles and Bungay These needs MUST be part of ALL development packages. Environmental issues such as water supply, sewage, wild animals and plants etc. also need to be catered for adequately if ANY of these plans come to fruition.
This area is only attractive to residents and visitors alike because it is largely rural and unspoilt. It strikes me that wherever possible brownfield sites like former airfields should be used long before ANY agricultural or conservation land is used to satisfy an unproven (in this area) demand for housing. There is also plenty of land inside urban areas such as Lowestoft, Yarmouth and Ipswich which should be used for development first.
**Julie Reynolds**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 2 - Allotment land, Somerleyton

**Comment ID**  
192

**Comment**  
A good location in the village, well centred and would link well providing it utilises site number 47. Allotments must be re-sited.
Lisa Jackson

Section: Potential land for development 2 - Allotment land, Somerleyton

Comment ID: 263

Comment:
This is a very active allotment site, with very involved tenants. The allotments are not underused. They are nearly full to capacity. Many tenants have spent years building up their allotments, investing much time and money, which will be lost if building is approved in this area. Fruit trees on the sites will be especially difficult to relocate, and are particularly valuable, costing much to replace; not to mention the work involved in building up a new site, and the loss of produce during relocation.

The access to the site is via a single lane, one way, small unpaved private road around The Green. This road already suffers from an abnormally large amount of traffic, especially due to the Somerleyton Primary School being located on this road. The allotments are at the back of The Green, behind the houses. A dirt track leads off The Green into the allotments. This is a tiny road, which only one vehicle at a time can pass through. With more homes, the amount of traffic would undoubtedly increase, and would be a danger to locals, particularly school children, and child, and elderly tenants. There are already problems with traffic going around The Green in the wrong direction, and speeding around it. There are parking issues also. There is not enough room for school vehicles to park, or for drop off/pickup, as well as tenants.

Another concern is that our water pressure is currently very low, and that building more homes will cause a problem with the water. There have been at least 2 occasions of burst water mains around the Green road in last 7 years. Can this area cope with the increased demands?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul Douch</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.1 Site Option 2 (presently allotment land) is located west of The Green and is accessed via an Estate-owned private road. This site is submitted for residential use. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 8.

10.2 The site is 1.6ha in size. According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 48 dwellings on this part of the site. However looking to neighbouring developments and their density and character a figure of 20 to 25 (including 7 affordable homes) is more appropriate.

10.3 The site is regularly shaped and is generally flat and has an existing vehicular access.

10.4 The site currently in allotment use but is otherwise unconstrained. Approximately 2/3 of the site (1ha) is in active allotment use.

10.5 It is understood that development of this allotment land would go hand in hand with the relocation of the allotments in the village. This is possible because of The Estate’s wider land ownership.

10.6 One potential site is immediately to the west of the current allotments. This site is larger than the current area in active allotment use and is adjacent to a footpath so would provide for better pedestrian access to the new allotments from the centre of the village.

Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal

10.7 The site sustainability appraisal (SSA) at Point 1 states "loss of allotments and no replacement facilities proposed". This is incorrect.

10.8 In our submissions to the Call for Sites stage (E374.C1.Rep01 paragraph 9.4) we said: "It is understood that development of this allotment land would go hand in hand with the relocation of the allotments in the village. This is possible because of The Estate’s wider land ownership. One potential site is immediately to the west of the current allotments. This site is larger than the current area in active allotment use and is adjacent to a footpath so would provide for better pedestrian access to the new allotments from the centre of the village."

10.9 The potential replacement allotment site was shown on our drawing E374/CFSS submitted with the Call for Sites information.

10.10 For the avoidance of doubt reference to this area of potential
rereplacement allotment is repeated above and shown again on the plan in Appendix 8.

10.11 At Point 4 the SSA states "loss of allotments and limited community facilities located in the village". This is incorrect.
10.12 The allotments were and remain proposed to be replace on land adjacent. Also the Waveney village profile or Somerleyton confirms that there is a full suite of key facilities and this needs to be recognised. Suggest the effect should be increased to 0 or +.
10.13 At Point 5 the SSA states "limited potential to deliver affordable housing". This is incorrect. Every other site in Somerleyton has been recognised as being able "to deliver affordable housing" and Site Option 2 is no different. Suggest this effect is raised to + in line with the site assessments in Somerleyton.
10.14 Point 9 of the SSA (which states "likely to create exposed settlement edge") is contradicted by Point 12 (which acknowledges the "hedgerows along the site boundaries").
10.15 The hedgerows are substantial and there is an earth embankment too. Point 9 should score at least 0 (neutral).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Potential land for development 3 - Ashfield Stables, Hall Lane, Oulton

### Environment Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 3 - Ashfield Stables, Hall Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:  
*Source Protection Zone* 3  
*Source Protection Zone* - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 3 - Ashfield Stables, Hall Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | • Sites not suitable for development:  
3 Ashfield Stables, Hall Lane  
We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure. |
### Potential land for development 4 - Blundeston Road (west end), Blundeston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 4 - Blundeston Road (west end), Blundeston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Suggest that this is planted as a woodland area to make wildlife habitation. The village of Blundeston will become Carlton Colville if further development is permitted. Just take a drive down The Street in Blundeston along the obstacle course and mish mash of parked cars and current overdevelopment. On the plan so far no account is taken of any future development of the former prison site and the impact this could have. Blundeston is a village – keep it that way. This is simply greed and over development. We strongly object.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beverley Rose

Section
Potential land for development 4 - Blundeston Road (west end),
Blundeston

Comment ID
284

Comment
My comments apply to all the proposed plans for the village of Blundeston. Where is the infrastructure to build so many houses in Blundeston? School capacity and other local services? Why is the prison site not enough for Blundeston? Wildlife and f ornay will be drastically affected.
I hope that if houses are passed then building companies will be forced to build houses only with materials in keeping with the local area i.e Suffolk brick, tiling etc as previous and present house owners have had to do. Including natural hedging etc.
There are not many villages left in Suffolk that are unspoilt. I agree that a housing plan has to be made for the future generation but not for greedy land owners to make money. Brown field sites should be used as this is more environmentally friendly without the need to tear up the beautiful countryside of Suffolk. The prison should be enough for Blundeston.
There are no local jobs or proposed new businesses in the area and as well as having to construct new roads, build a new school or extend the village school, new doctor services etc, bus services to shops and the town will have to be operated to cater for those without cars, all at the expense of the tax payer. So the overall expense of all of this will not match the gain made for building so many houses. Blundeston will no longer be a village but a town.
I look forward to receiving your comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>I am writing to oppose the proposed plans for future land for housing development in the Blundeston Road area of Corton – sites 4, 164, 165. We have only just been made aware of these plans! I object on environmental grounds and totally oppose more of our valuable farmland being lost. With regard to climate change carbon is stored in soil and not in concrete. This will have a major impact on wildlife. My neighbour has reported seeing 30 different species of birds in his garden. I am also concerned about the danger of flooding as a result of more concrete being laid, especially as we seem to be having more erratic weather patterns and exceptionally heavy rain. Where will all this additional water go? If more houses are built how will the local schools, doctors surgeries cope? We have already lost Oulton surgery and there is a difficulty finding more G.Ps. Surely in Lowestoft there are many empty sites and also couldn’t the Council purchase properties that have been empty and neglected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
<th>Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Key Questions Q5 Are there any areas of land you think are suitable or not suitable for development? Reydon - Rissemere Land and Easton Bavents are unsuitable - also the field across from Keens Lane. Could perhaps add some houses near Pitches View.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clive Tickner

Section Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID 105

Comment Wholly inappropriate development on AONB farmland. Traffic problems will arise from the fact that there are only two roads from the A12 to Southwold. This will create a village within a village and the local infrastructure will be unable to support it. If we need so many new homes why try to shoehorn them in around an existing peaceful environment? Why not earmark a large area outside of an AONB to build a new village from the start, as has been done with the huge new development near Carlton?
**Environment Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:

- **Source Protection Zone 3**
  - *Source Protection Zone* - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic England Debbie Mack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Elmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs McNally

Section Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID 210

Comment We attended the meeting on Tuesday 10 May to view the Waveney Local Plan. We were surprised to see so many homes planned for Reydon. Is there really a need for this amount of extra housing in this area? We asked the Planning Officer if the necessary infrastructure would be put in place prior to or at the same time the homes would be built. We were shocked to be told that this would not be the case and their remit was just to built houses and there was no link up with any necessary services. We pointed out that there are currently long waiting times for appointments at the Health Centre and treatment times at the James Paget A&E are below targets. The Planning Officer said that shortage of doctors is a nationwide problem and any improvements needed cannot be part of the housing development plan. There also appears to be no firm plans proposed for more school places, jobs, shops, sewage capacity etc. for the 972 homes mentioned.

It would appear that the area will be overdeveloped to provide housing with no thought for the well being of existing or new residents. Surely this cannot be right and we are writing to ask what action you will be taking. There is also the concern that a lot of the new property will be second homes and holiday lets and wonder if you will be considering adopting the St Ives ruling of not allowing this type of person to purchase new properties. This would make it less attractive to developers to build such large housing developments.

One last point when does a village enlarge so much to qualify to become a town?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>612</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This area of land is adjacent to a very dangerous corner crossing, Green lane and Wangford Road. Traffic around this junction cannot properly see round the tight corner, adding up to possibly 75 houses would make this problem even worse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section: Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID: 1129

Comment: [Therefore,] none of the proposed large sites offered for development around Reydon (5,6,38, 117,18,138 in the options consultation, p51) will be needed and we believe these should not be considered for designation as development sites in the final Local Plan. Our residents strongly opposed the expansion of the village envelope in their response to the consultation for our Village Plan in 2014 which was confirmed more recently in the public response to the current application to develop land at St Felix School (site 138). There is simply no case for major development of housing or business accommodation on any of these sites, given the analysis of the housing needs set out above and the availability of undeveloped land at the current Reydon Business Park.
Ruth & John Pigneguy

Section: Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID: 171

Comment: Many residents have moved here to live in a semi-natural area. These sites look like massive over-development. Second homes need to be controlled so that we can have local full time residents living here.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section: Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID: 592

Comment: We believe this site is unsuitable for development. It is outside the boundary of the settlement in open countryside which is part of the AONB and is of a size that is not needed if the target for new housing in Southwold and Reydon is kept at the lower range in the options (ie growth is concentrated in Lowestoft). The infrastructure, in particular the sewage system, is inadequate for this scale of development.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 5 - Brambles Drift, Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID 752

Comment Sites 5; 26 and 38 are in close proximity of Benacre to Easton Bavents SPA and Pakefield to Easton Bavents Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on either the SPA or the SSSI.
Potential land for development 6 - Broadside Park Farm, Reydon

Anonymous

Section  
Potential land for development 6 - Broadside Park Farm, Reydon

Comment ID  
1224

Comment  
Key Questions Q5 Are there any areas of land you think are suitable or not suitable for development? Reydon - Rissemere Land and Easton Bavents are unsuitable - also the field across from Keens Lane. Could perhaps add some houses near Pitches View.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Clive Tickner</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Lavery

Section  
Potential land for development 6 - Broadside Park Farm, Reydon

Comment ID  
144

Comment  
This site could only be used for something temporary as it has limited services (roads, sewage etc) and will be a victim of coastal erosion within relatively few years. I suspect there would be strong objections locally to any notion of a traveller or holiday site here as either would be unsightly, possibly noisy, and too close to Southwold.
Kevin Cross

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 6 - Broadside Park Farm, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Broadside Park Farm seems to be a suitable location for holiday homes. I am not so sure about other purposes such as Traveller site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marya Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 6 - Broadside Park Farm, Reydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Any development this close to the coast seems ill-advised as it is so prone to erosion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Potential land for development 6 - Broadside Park Farm, Reydon

Comment ID 1130

Comment [Therefore,] none of the proposed large sites offered for development around Reydon (5,6,38, 117,18,138 in the options consultation, p51) will be needed and we believe these should not be considered for designation as development sites in the final Local Plan. Our residents strongly opposed the expansion of the village envelope in their response to the consultation for our Village Plan in 2014 which was confirmed more recently in the public response to the current application to develop land at St Felix School (site 138). There is simply no case for major development of housing or business accommodation on any of these sites, given the analysis of the housing needs set out above and the availability of undeveloped land at the current Reydon Business Park.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saty Joshi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | Dear Sir/Madam.... What an excellent idea for public consultation on Planning issues. I am an owner of 2-Plots (#217 and #218, total 4000 sq ft) on Broadside Park Farm, Reydon. Many owners of the 300+ such plots at this location are now coming forward thus increasing the identifiable area for development at Broadside Park Farm. Is log being kept of all the plot owners? 

Being close to the coast and open landscapes, this looks like an ideal location for premium holiday homes or care homes for the elderly. 

Many thanks,

S.Joshi |
## Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 6 - Broadside Park Farm, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This site is entirely unsuitable for development. It is remote from the settlement of Reydon, in open countryside which is part of the AONB, and close to the reedbeds which are of national significance. The access of traffic to and from any development on this site onto the busy Lowestoft Road would be dangerous and a nearby proposed (much smaller) development for the Pathfinder scheme was ruled unsuitable because of traffic impact concerns from the highway authority. If the development of this site were to include a traveller's site and/or a residential care home, these traffic concerns would increase still further. The scale of development proposed here is both totally inappropriate and unneeded to meet the target of new housing for Southwold and Reydon if the option to concentrate growth in the district around Lowestoft is adopted, which in our view is the most appropriate option for the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Potential land for development 6 - Broadside Park Farm, Reydon

Comment ID 1098

Comment Site 6 in Easton Bavents is inappropriate for any development due to lack of infrastructure, its location on a high point on agricultural land in the AONB and on the Suffolk Heritage Coast, and rapidly progressing coastal erosion, which, at this particular location, is happening at a faster rate than anticipated in previous projections.

It is recommended that new surveys be undertaken to revise coastal erosion estimates for Easton Bavents.
**Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer**

**Section**  Potential land for development 6 - Broadside Park Farm, Reydon

**Comment ID**  755

**Comment**  Site 6 appears to partly include Pakefield to Easton Bavents SSSI. We therefore consider that this site should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on the SSSI.
### Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville /Lowestoft

**Andrew Hughes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville /Lowestoft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This development would impinge visually on Suffolk Wildlife land the other side of the railway and the development being on rising land would be visible from the marshes. Traffic from this development can only head onto Beccles Road which is already very busy and would inevitably send Traffic going North via Oulton Broad rather than the new Third Crossing putting fresh pressure on the traffic situation there. Would put further pressure on existing local community requirements like heath and schooling as the site isn't big enough to absorb or justify new community developments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville / Lowestoft

Comment ID 990

Comment I wish to draw your attention to the fact that Waveney District Council, in its new Local Plan for the District, have indicated that land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road in South Oulton Broad is potentially earmarked for development. These areas - marked 111, 112 and 7 on their interactive map - are hard up against the boundary of the Broads National Park and Carlton Marshes and as a result seem wholly unsuitable for building. The areas are currently green fields which form a barrier between the housing to the south of the Beccles Road and the marshes and broad. Any development here would be visible from the Broads National Park from the Carlton Marshes right along to Nicholas Everitt Park in Oulton Broad itself. Properties on the north side of Oulton Broad would also see the housing along with boat users, walkers and other broad users. Many species of wildlife would be disturbed and misplaced should any development take place, and we have regularly seen barn owls hunting in the areas outlined. We feel the Carlton Marshes and Southern Broads would be severely compromised with housing hard up against the park boundary and another wilderness area would be lost forever. Surely there are enough brownfield sites in Lowestoft to develop? The scale of the planned housing is also frightening; 37 houses on plot 111 which will go nowhere to solving any shortage - and a staggering 760 in area 7, which will create a village on top of the marshes. As family members of Suffolk Wildlife Trust, we have contacted them with the proposals of which they are aware and are currently preparing a response. We would implore you to investigate this matter urgently as well and if you require any further information from us please do not hesitate to contact us.
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section
Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville /Lowestoft

Comment ID
860

Comment
Sites 7 /112 /111 – These lie along the Broads boundary albeit separated by the railway line. Potential for impacts on Landscape character (LCA6) and visual amenity. This would extend the urban boundary of Lowestoft towards the Broads area. Certainly there are likely to be additional recreational pressures as a result of housing development in the area. The Suffolk wildlife Trust and the Carlton marshes reserve lie in close proximity. Housing development at this locating could also create additional land use pressures on fields and grazing marsh in close proximity as residents may seek land for other activities such as allotments, horse grazing etc.
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section  Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville /Lowestoft

Comment ID  1230

Comment  The Areas 7 and 112 and 111 west of Beccles Road should be kept clear of additional development in order to preserve the wild life of the marshes.
**Environment Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville /Lowestoft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints: Partly in Flood Zone 3  
*Flood Zone – A floodplain is the area that would naturally be affected by flooding if a river rises above its banks, or high tides and stormy seas cause flooding in coastal areas.  
Martin Fiddes

Section
Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville /Lowestoft

Comment ID
234

Comment
This area is completely unsuitable for new housing as the surrounding road system and main access road - the A146 - is already running at more than capacity, which is clear from the regular tailbacks which stretch from Oulton Broad right back to Hollow Grove Way. The site also backs on to the Broads National Park and Carlton Marshes, managed by the Suffolk Wildlife Trust, and they are very unlikely to allow development to take place right up to their boundary. The area is also home to many species of wildlife which would clearly be disturbed.
Surely it makes sense to look at developing brownfield sites and there are plenty of ex-industrial areas in the Lowestoft area which should be considered and used before contemplating using greenfield areas?
I also note there are very few areas around Southwold and Reydon marked as suitable for development?
Matthew Gooch

Section: Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville / Lowestoft

Comment ID: 282

Comment: The development of a large number of housing here will put extreme pressure on Carlton Marshes Nature Reserve and the SSSI designations on it which at present suffer from a wildlife disturbance and site misuse point of view.

A further few hundred houses here will mean an increase in dogs walkers using the site and people that the very sensitive condition of the the habitats that are classed as some of the best of their type in the UK will not sustain without major detriment to an area of much enjoyment for the 70,000 people already living in the town. And instead of putting pressure on the nature reserves doorstep we should consider protecting this area for many years to come for the use and pleasure of the people already living in the local area and beyond.

Pressure will increase on wildlife from disturbance an issue that nature conservation struggles with now and the risk here of increased poor quality water ending up in the dykes of high nature conservation for there excellent water quality is also high from increased surface covering, the current internal drainage board system can only just cope with the quantities of water that arrive there from small amounts of rainfall in the catchment which heightens the flood risk of the sensitive sites.
**Comment ID**

228

**Comment**

I feel this area especially the space closest to Marsh lane should be left as green area, currently there are horses and on this land and is close to the local community which makes this ideal for owners of such animals also there are allot of deer in the area.

Building in this semi rural area would reduce the green belt and ruin an area of some natural beauty. Two story housing would be a complete eyesore and frankly be a misjudgement.

Marsh lane its self is a one vehicle lane road and this could not carry a greater increase of traffic.

People have bought housing in the area for its tranquility, building would effect this and house prices in the area in a negative way.

We in this are would be strongly opposed to any development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville /Lowestoft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Oppose on visual impact, effect on nature reserve, runoff into SSI., light pollution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S Lineham

Section Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville /Lowestoft

Comment ID 433

Comment This land is not suitable for development. It provides an open vista towards Oulton Broad, which is important for the local landscape. It is used by gulls, barn owls, deer and foxes and provides a buffer between houses and the nature reserve and Broads National Park.

Beccles Road is already overwhelmed by traffic and is often queued up to the Crown roundabout in the direction of Oulton Broad. Traffic is also heavy in the other direction and queues during peak times around the Barnby bends. The A146 cannot absorb this extra traffic in either direction, and there is not enough employment in Lowestoft and local area so people will need to travel for work. There is not the capacity in local health services or schools either.

The increased number of people in the immediate vicinity will be highly likely have an adverse impact on nearby Carlton Marshes nature reserve which includes an SSSI. Already there are problems with dogs off leads and fouling, and also antisocial behaviour which is likely to increase with higher volumes of people.

Drainage water could cause pollution in the marshes further down the hill and adversely affect septic tank drainage of properties including the education centre for the wildlife trust,
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

**Section**
Potential land for development 7 - Burnt Hill Lane to Marsh Lane, Carlton Colville / Lowestoft

**Comment ID**
717

**Comment**
Sites 7; 11 and 112 are adjacent to parts of the Broadland Special Protection Area (SPA); The Broads Special Area of Conservation (SAC); the Broadland Ramsar site and Sprat’s Water & Marshes, Carlton Coleville Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), these sites are of national and international nature conservation value and a large part of them is owned and managed by Suffolk Wildlife Trust as part of our Carlton and Oulton Marshes reserve. Development in this location appears likely to risk an adverse impact on these sites. The sites may also have ecological value in their own right. For these reasons we would object to their allocation for development.
Potential land for development 8 - Chenery's Land (East), Cucumber Lane, Beccles / Land at Chenery's Farm, Beccles

Beccles Society Paul Fletcher

Section  
Potential land for development 8 - Chenery's Land (East), Cucumber Lane, Beccles / Land at Chenery's Farm, Beccles

Comment ID  
685

Comment  
The corridor adjacent to the Beccles Relief Road should only be developed for housing on a limited scale ie. not all the sites listed should be identified for housing.
Gill Griffiths

Section Potential land for development 8 - Chenery's Land (East), Cucumber Lane, Beccles / Land at Chenery's Farm, Beccles

Comment ID 774

Comment We wish to make the following additional points in respect of Site Option 8: Chenerys Land (East), Cucumber Lane, Beccles.

Point 1 - To improve the health and well-being of the local population: Although the site adjoins open countryside it has easy access to local services, being a little over 1 mile from the town centre. Links to existing and future pedestrian and cycle networks (which already exist to the east and west of the site) will be built into the development design. This includes linking to the new networks created as part of the approved Southern Relief Road. Walking and cycling will be encouraged thereby in the scheme design. Future occupiers of the site will not therefore need to over rely on the use of vehicles for access to everyday requirements.

Point 4 - To improve access to key services and facilities: The site is within walking (as well as cycling) distance of shops, schools and local facilities as well as the Oak Lane and Cucumber Lane publically maintained accesses. There are no existing public rights of way over the site however there is a footpath to the North of the site that connects to the nearby school. Crowfoot Community Primary School and Albert Pye Community Primary School are both just over 1km away and within walking distance of the site. There is also a range of nursery schools in the vicinity. There are a number of public bus services with nearby bus stops on Queen Elizabeth drive and Banham Road. The buses provide a regular connection to the neighbouring market towns, The City of Norwich and The Coast. Beccles railway station, although just outside the maximum acceptable 2km walking distance, is within the recommended cycling distance and has good cycle storage facilities available. Trains from here run frequently to Lowestoft and Ipswich providing links to the wider national rail network. Primary access would be as for BEC 3 via Cucumber Lane / Oak Lane.

If and when the proposed southern relief road is built two alternative access routes may be possible, both avoiding the town centre. The traffic impact of the new relief road will be positive either way, as it will reduce existing vehicular movements (estimated at 200 daily) along Cucumber Lane via Banham Road / Queen Elizabeth Drive. Policy 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") refers to the need for LPA's to take...
Options for the new Waveney Local Plan | Consultation responses

local circumstances into account (in this case the advent of the relief road) to respond to different opportunities to achieve sustainable development.

Point 6 – To meet the housing requirements of the whole community: The NPPF places great emphasis on sustainable development and it is a fundamental requirement of development proposals that they satisfy the three principles of sustainability, social, economic and environmental, as set out in paragraph 7 of the framework.

Section 6 of the NPPF places a requirement on Local Planning authorities to: "...use their evidence base to ensure Local plans meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, s far s is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to he delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.

Additional requirements of the NPPF are the need for sites to be deliverable and developable. To be considered deliverable, "...sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that the development site is viable".

To be considered developable "...sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at this point envisaged".

It is our view that this complies with all of these specific requirements.

The WDC Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment Methodology Consultation Document – Oct 2015 repeats the requirements of the NPPF in terms of assessing whether sites are Deliverable or Developable.

In this document "deliverable sites" are defined as sites which are suitable, available now and achievable within five years. Site no 9, Chenery’s, Land, Cucumber Lane, Beccles meets all of these requirements.

"Developable sites" are described as sites which are suitable with a reasonable prospect hat they could be available and achievable within the plan period.

The document states that a site will normally be considered "Available" if it is within the ownership of a developer who has expressed an intention to develop / sell the land for development. This site meets the requirements.

A site will be considered "Achievable" where there is reasonable prospect that development will occur on the site at a particular time. A key factor is the economic viability of the site. Influences include market attractiveness, the location of the site and any abnormal constraints on the site. Beccles is a very popular place to live which commands an extremely strong position in the local housing market. There are no known abnormal constraints on
developing this site. We consider therefore this site meets the requirements that allow it to be considered achievable.

Section 3:11 of the Site Specific Allocations for the Beccles area (adopted January 2011) acknowledged that due to the very limited opportunities to allocate brown field sites on the edge of the built up area that greenfield land would be allocated. Specific reference was made in policy 3.44 in connection with BEC3 to "the land at Cucumber Lane / Oak Lane being the next best available site despite being classified as greenfield".

Site No 8 provides the opportunity to develop in a sustainable location that is away from areas prone to flooding and that is accessible by other modes of transport without reliance by the private car. Emphasis will be upon homes which are inclusive, accessible, adaptable, sustainable and good value.

Point 7 – To maintain air quality:
Proximity to the town centre and pedestrian / cyclist routes should mean less traffic movements than there would be with an out of town development.

Point 8 – To maintain and improve water quality:
Recent reports from Anglian Water and Essex and Suffolk suggest that there is capacity in the supply and sewerage treatment system to accommodate such development as is proposed.
An appropriate mix of ponds, swales and other relevant sustainable measures would be incorporated to provide surface water disposal.

Point 9 – To conserve and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of landscape and townscapes:
The "irregular shape" of the site must be seen in the context of the permitted development to the immediate north (BEC 3) and south (Landoc).
Arguably, the site could be described as infill. Development would be designed to blend in with the existing landscape and surroundings.

Point 10 - To reduce contributions to climate change and mitigate the effects:
Low carbon processes will be employed during the development process where appropriate and viable. Renewable energy sources may become viable and flexibility will be provided to allow for this.
The connectivity of the site is a significant factor; travel by car is not essential from this site.

Point 11- To consider natural resources:
As the site is bounded to its north and south by development sites arguments about the loss of greenfield land are circumvent able. The land is low quality Grade 3 agricultural land, which has consistently yielded lesser crop returns than neighbouring land.
Point 12 – To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity: Recent studies suggest there is no flood risk to the site. Development strategy would ensure there is no offsite flood risk either. Appropriate measures will be taken at the design stage to allow for drainage from the site and to ensure that long term biodiversity and geodiversity is maintained and supported.

Point 14 – To achieve sustained and realistic economic growth. Economic growth generally would be stimulated by the provision of a choice of homes near to the town, business parks and Enterprise Zone. NPPF policy 23 requires LPA’s to recognize town centres as being the heart of communities and requires policies which support their viability and vitality. The forecast in Waneney’s core strategy was for over 5,000 new jobs in the district by 2025, with 20% of these in the market towns. Paragraph 3.22 of that document included in the guiding principles for the development of Beccles:

- The attractive and historic town centre having a broader range of shops and services;
- Beccles Business Park offering increased opportunities for work.

The adopted Core Strategy (CS) identified a need for 6,960 homes to be built in Waveney between 2001-2025 at an average rate of 290/ year. The WDC AMR 2014/2015 confirms that the total number of dwellings completed up to March 31st 2015 is in line with the CS requirements but annual completions for the last couple of years have been significantly less than the annual target of 290.

The new Local Plan will cover the period up to 2036. It is acknowledged there is a need to plan for significant growth. Waveney’s population is both a growing and ageing one. Between 2011 (the date of the last census) and 2036 it is forecast that the population of the district will grow by at least 8000. It has also been confirmed that more people are moving into the area than leaving it and households are getting smaller. Even with no population growth therefore there is a need to plan for more housing. The consultation document "Options for the New Local Plan" identifies three different growth scenarios which show different levels of housing and economic growth during the local plan period. Annual housing growth could range from 308 dwellings (dw)/year, 340dw/year or 380 dw/ year. The document also proposes four different options for how growth and development should be distributed throughout the district, with Lowestoft accommodating a minimum of 55% of proposed new development and potentially up to 75%. Whichever one of the options for growth outlined in the consultation document is decided upon, significant growth is still anticipated for Beccles, the largest of the market towns.
Development on this edge of town site would help WDC meet its housing targets and would be conducive to the achievement of the 2 objectives in para 3.22. The town centre would almost certainly attract greater investment from higher footfall and demand and travel to work time would be minimal. The size of the site and scale of the proposed development should allay concern about any potential threat to the loss of business to out of town retail developments or over expansion and ruination of the historic town centre.

An established local developer has committed to the early development of the site with a relatively short timescale, subject to a satisfactory Planning Permission.

Policy 14 of the NPPF requires LPA’s to "positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area".

The development itself will create new jobs during the construction phase and provide opportunity for a range of associated service providers once complete.

Point 16 – To enhance the viability and vitality of town centres.

Policy 23 of the NPPF refers to the promoting of competitive town centres with more choice and offerings and to the important role played by residential development in this respect. Increased town centre investment would be encouraged by increased footfall from nearby developments.

Policy 24 of the NPPF refers to preference being given in out of town centre proposals to "accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre".

Site 8 satisfies both of these requirements.

Point 17 – To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

The site is bounded by national regional cycle route 30, which together with existing byways and footpaths, provide easy access by foot and by bicycle to areas of employment in the town centre the existing employment areas, Enterprise Zone, nearby Beccles Business Park and Ellough Industrial area. The proposed future footway / cycleway and the extension of the byway linking Oak Lane to Ellough Road, which will be constructed as part of the approved relief road, will further the opportunity for efficient patterns of movement to support economic growth.
Nicky Elliott

Section: Potential land for development 8 - Chenery's Land (East), Cucumber Lane, Beccles / Land at Chenery's Farm, Beccles

Comment ID: 465

Comment: I think this site, along with sites 81 and 9, provide the best location for the required development in Beccles, provided that access for motor vehicles is made from the Southern Relief Road only. Vehicles will be able to leave and enter the development from east and west via the Southern Relief Road and then north and south on A roads. Other residential roads adjacent to these lands (Darby Road, Nicholson Drive and Cucumber Lane) should provide cycle and pedestrian access only. If the three sites were developed together, the developer could be required to provide some infrastructure such as a community centre, shops, school, health centre, pub, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 9 - Chenery's Land (West), Cucumber Lane, Beccles / Land at Chenery's Farm, Beccles

Beccles Society Paul Fletcher

Section | Potential land for development 9 - Chenery's Land (West), Cucumber Lane, Beccles / Land at Chenery's Farm, Beccles

Comment ID | 686

Comment | The corridor adjacent to the Beccles Relief Road should only be developed for housing on a limited scale ie. not all the sites listed should be identified for housing.
Potential land for development 9 - Chenery's Land (West), Cucumber Lane, Beccles / Land at Chenery’s Farm, Beccles

Comment ID 775

Comment

We wish to make the following additional points in respect of Site Option 9: Chenerys Land (west), Cucumber Lane, Beccles.

Point 1 - To improve the health and well-being of the local population:
Although the site adjoins open countryside it has easy access to local services, being a little over 1 mile from the town centre. Links to existing and future pedestrian footpaths, bridleways and the regional cycle network (which already exist to the east and south of the site) will be built into the development design. This includes linking to the new networks created as part of the approved Southern Relief Road. Walking and cycling will be encouraged thereby in the scheme design. Future occupiers of the site will not need to over rely on the use of vehicles for access to everyday requirements.

Point 4 - To improve access to key services and facilities:
The site is within walking (as well as cycling) distance of shops, schools and local facilities as well as the Oak Lane and Cucumber Lane publically maintained accesses.
There are no existing public rights of way over the site however there is a footpath to the North of the site that connects to the nearby school. Crowfoot Community Primary School and Albert Pye Community Primary School are both just over 1km away and within walking distance of the site. There is also a range of nursery schools in the vicinity.
There are a number of public bus services with nearby bus stops on Queen Elizabeth drive and Banham Road. The buses provide a regular connection to the neighbouring market towns, The City of Norwich and The Coast. Beccles railway station, although just outside the maximum acceptable 2km walking distance, is within the recommended cycling distance and has good cycle storage facilities available. Trains from here run frequently to Lowestoft and Ipswich providing links to the wider national rail network.
Primary access would be as for BEC 3 via Cucumber Lane / Oak Lane. If and when the proposed southern relief road is built two alternative access routes may be possible, both avoiding the town centre. The traffic impact of the new relief road will be positive either way, as it will reduce existing vehicular movements (estimated at 200 daily) along Cucumber Lane via Banham Road / Queen Elizabeth Drive. Policy 10 of the National...
Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") refers to the need for LPA's to take local circumstances into account (in this case the advent of the relief road) to respond to different opportunities to achieve sustainable development.

Point 6 – To meet the housing requirements of the whole community:
The NPPF places great emphasis on sustainable development and it is a fundamental requirement of development proposals that they satisfy the three principles of sustainability, social, economic and environmental, as set out in paragraph 7 of the framework.

Section 6 of the NPPF places a requirement on Local Planning authorities to: "...use their evidence base to ensure Local plans meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, s far s is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to he delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.

Additional requirements of the NPPF are the need for sites to be deliverable and developable. To be considered deliverable, "...sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that the development site is viable".

To be considered developable "...sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at this point envisaged".

It is our view that this complies with all of these specific requirements.

The WDC Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment Methodology Consultation Document – Oct 2015 repeats the requirements of the NPPF in terms of assessing whether sites are Deliverable or Developable.

In this document "deliverable sites" are defined as sites which are suitable, available now and achievable within five years. Site no 9, Chenerys, Land, Cucumber Lane, Beccles meets all of these requirements.

"Developable sites" are described as sites which are suitable with a reasonable prospect that they could be available and achievable within the plan period.

The document states that a site will normally be considered "Available" if it is within the ownership of a developer who has expressed an intention to develop / sell the land for development. This site meets the requirements.

A site will be considered "Achievable" where there is reasonable prospect that development will occur on the site at a particular time. A key factor is the economic viability of the site. Influences include market attractiveness, the location of the site and any abnormal constraints on the site. Beccles is a very popular place to live which commands an extremely strong position.
in the local housing market. There are no known abnormal constraints on developing this site. We consider therefore this site meets the requirements that allow it to be considered achievable.

Section 3:11 of the Site Specific Allocations for the Beccles area (adopted January 2011) acknowledged that due to the very limited opportunities to allocate brown field sites on the edge of the built up area that greenfield land would be allocated. Specific reference was made in policy 3.44 in connection with BEC3 to “the land at Cucumber Lane / Oak Lane being the next best available site despite being classified as greenfield”.

Site No 9 provides the opportunity to develop in a sustainable location that is away from areas prone to flooding and that is accessible by other modes of transport without reliance by the private car. Emphasis will be upon homes which are inclusive, accessible, adaptable, sustainable and good value.

Point 7 – To maintain air quality:
Proximity to the town centre and pedestrian / cyclist routes should mean less traffic movements than there would be with an out of town development.

Point 8 – To maintain and improve water quality:
Recent reports from Anglian Water and Essex and Suffolk suggest that there is capacity in the supply and sewerage treatment system to accommodate such development as is proposed.

An appropriate mix of ponds, swales and other relevant sustainable measures would be incorporated to provide surface water disposal.

Point 9 – To conserve and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape:
The site adjoins existing residential development to the North. Development would be designed to blend in with the existing landscape and surroundings and incorporate appropriate green amenity space and structural planting.

Point 10 - To reduce contributions to climate change and mitigate the effects:
Low carbon processes will be employed during the development process where appropriate and viable. Renewable energy sources may become viable and flexibility will be provided to allow for this.

The connectivity of the site is a significant factor; travel by car is not essential from this site.

Point 11- To consider natural resources:
The site is bounded to its north by existing residential development. The land is low quality Grade 3 agricultural land, which has consistently yielded lesser crop returns than neighbouring land.
Point 12 – To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity: Recent studies suggest there is no flood risk to the site. Development strategy would ensure there is no offsite flood risk either. Appropriate measures will be taken at the design stage to allow for drainage from the site and to ensure that long term biodiversity and geodiversity is maintained and supported.

Point 14 – To achieve sustained and realistic economic growth. Economic growth generally would be stimulated by the provision of a choice of homes near to the town, business parks and Enterprise Zone. NPPF policy 23 requires LPA's to recognize town centres as being the heart of communities and requires policies which support their viability and vitality. The forecast in Waneney's core strategy was for over 5,000 new jobs in the district by 2025, with 20% of these in the market towns. Paragraph 3.22 of that document included in the guiding principles for the development of Beccles:
- "the attractive and historic town centre having a broader range of shops and services;
- Beccles Business Park offering increased opportunities for work".

The adopted Core Strategy (CS) identified a need for 6,960 homes to be built in Waveney between 2001-2025 at an average rate of 290/year. The WDC AMR 2014/2015 confirms that the total number of dwellings completed up to March 31st 2015 is in line with the CS requirements but annual completions for the last couple of years have been significantly less than the annual target of 290.

The new Local Plan will cover the period up to 2036. It is acknowledged there is a need to plan for significant growth. Waveney’s population is both a growing and ageing one. Between 2011 (the date of the last census) and 2036 it is forecast that the population of the district will grow by at least 8000. It has also been confirmed that more people are moving into the area than leaving it and households are getting smaller. Even with no population growth therefore there is a need to plan for more housing. The consultation document "Options for the New Local Plan” identifies three different growth scenarios which show different levels of housing and economic growth during the local plan period. Annual housing growth could range from 308 dwellings (dw)/year, 340dw/year or 380 dw/year. The document also proposes four different options for how growth and development should be distributed throughout the district, with Lowestoft accommodating a minimum of 55% of proposed new development and potentially up to 75%. Whichever one of the options for growth outlined in the consultation document is decided, significant growth is still anticipated.
for Beccles, the largest of the market towns. Development on this edge of town site would help WDC meet its housing targets and would be conducive to the achievement of the 2 objectives in para 3.22. The town centre would almost certainly attract greater investment from higher footfall and demand and travel to work time would be minimal. The size of the site and scale of the proposed development should allay concern about any potential threat to the loss of business to out of town retail developments or over expansion and ruination of the historic town centre.

An established local developer has committed to the early development of the site with a relatively short timescale, subject to a satisfactory Planning Permission.

Policy 14 of the NPPF requires LPA's to "positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area". The development itself will create new jobs during the construction phase and provide opportunity for a range of associated service providers once complete.

Point 16 – To enhance the viability and vitality of town centres.
Policy 23 of the NPPF refers to the promoting of competitive town centres with more choice and offerings and to the important role played by residential development in this respect. Increased town centre investment would be encouraged by increased footfall from nearby developments.

Policy 24 of the NPPF refers to preference being given in out of town centre proposals to "accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre". Site 9 satisfies both of these requirements.

Point 17 – To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

The site is bounded by national regional cycle route 30, which together with existing byways and footpaths, provide easy access by foot and by bicycle to areas of employment in the town centre the existing employment areas, Enterprise Zone, nearby Beccles Business Park and Ellough Industrial area. The proposed future footway / cycleway and the extension of the byway linking Oak Lane to Ellough Road, which will be constructed as part of the approved relief road, will further the opportunity for efficient patterns of movement to support economic growth.
Nicky Elliott

Section  
Potential land for development 9 - Chenery's Land (West), Cucumber Lane, Beccles / Land at Chenery’s Farm, Beccles

Comment ID  
467

Comment  
I think this site, along with sites 81 and 8, provide the best location for the required development in Beccles, provided that access for motor vehicles is made from the Southern Relief Road only. Vehicles will be able to leave and enter the development from the east and west via the Southern Relief Road, and then north and south on A roads. Other residential roads adjacent to these lands (Darby Road, Nicholson Drive and Cucumber Lane) should provide cycle and pedestrian access only. If the three sites were developed together, the developer could be required to provide some infrastructure such as a community centre, shops, school, health centre, pub, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road, Halesworth / Holton

Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK Hannah Lorna Bevins

Section Potential land for development 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road, Halesworth / Holton

Comment ID 1141

Comment

The following sites have been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/ HP apparatus:
* 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane
* 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road
* 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road
* 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane

National Grid Gas Distribution would like to take this opportunity to advise prospective land developers and the local authority of the following:

Crossing of assets: Construction traffic should only cross the pipeline at locations agreed with National Grid. To facilitate these crossings protection or diversion may be required; depending on site condition and pipe parameters.

Cable Crossings: For all assets, the contractor / developer will need to consider the clearance and necessary protection measures. The crossing must be perpendicular to the asset. The crossing may require a deed of consent to be agreed prior to work commencing.

Piling: No piling should take place within 15m of gas distribution assets without prior agreement from a National Grid Representative.

Pipeline Safety: National Grid will need to ensure that access to the pipelines is maintained during and after construction.

Our HP/IP pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation to be monitored by a National Grid representative. Ground cover above gas distribution mains should not be reduced or increased. Our MP/LP mains will not be as deep as the pipelines.

A National Grid representative may be required to monitor any excavations or any embankment or dredging works within 3 metres of a HP/IP pipeline.
or within 10 metres of an Above Ground Installations (AGI). Monitoring of works in relation to MP/LP assets may be required by a National Grid representative. National Grid steel pipelines are cathodically protected to prevent corrosion to the pipeline. For further information please refer to SSW/22 (see further advice section below).

If you require any further information in relation to the above please contact National Grid's Plant Protection team via the email address at the top of this letter.

Appendices - National Grid Assets

Please find attached in:

* Appendix 1 provides maps of the sites referenced above in relation to the affected National Grid Gas Distribution (Intermediate Pressure /High Pressure) assets outlined above.
(map enclosed)
Environment Agency

Section
Potential land for development 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road, Halesworth / Holton

Comment ID
1158

Comment
We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:
Source Protection Zone 1
*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Halesworth Town Council N Rees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section  
Potential land for development 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road, Halesworth / Holton

Comment ID  
747

Comment  
Site 13 is adjacent to Fairview Farm Meadow CWS and, based on aerial photographs, may also contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that this site should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on either the CWS or any existing ecological value that the site has.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road, Halesworth / Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This site was identified as having very important natural habitat with newts, frogs and diverse wildlife and fauna. It was rejected as a site for sports development and a campaign by the owners and residents of Halesworth to preserve this natural area had the support of Mr Gummer (the then MP for Suffolk Coastal and Environment Minster). That natural wildlife and fauna is still active and must be preserved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Potential land for development 14 - Field, Saxon Way, Halesworth

**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 14 - Field, Saxon Way, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to Gothic House, grade II* listed building to west. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 14 - Field, Saxon Way, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Based on aerial photographs, sites 14; 76; 86; and 160 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 14 - Field, Saxon Way, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 14 in isolation has access problems onto Saxons Way and there are concerns that an additional residential care home, taking into account those awaiting planning approval, would increase generation/age imbalance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 14 - Field, Saxon Way, Halesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Isn't this a flood plain and therefore should not be given over for development. The 'Tesco Site' on the opposite side of Saxon Way is not shown for potential development so assume that is already progressing as it is by far the best site in Halesworth for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 15 - Firs Garage, Church Road, Uggeshall

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 15 - Firs Garage, Church Road, Uggeshall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment

Proximity to Church of St Mary, grade I as well as several grade II listed buildings including Church Farmhouse, Uggeshall House, Churchyard walling, Whitehouse Farm and barn. Potential impact upon setting of high grade listed building and other listed buildings.
Potential land for development 16 - Former Beccles Heat Treatment, Gosford Road, Beccles

Councillor Caroline Topping

Section Potential land for development 16 - Former Beccles Heat Treatment, Gosford Road, Beccles

Comment ID 978

Comment As I said earlier, I am not against Beccles having new affordable homes and bungalows however these need to be built in manageable sizes around the periphery of the town and brown field sites such as plot 16 (24 homes) in the town centre and plots 156 (260 homes), 43 (40 homes), 108 (49 homes) all along a current main road, where there is currently little development and not feeding into the current traffic hot spots which is Ingate Street/Lowestoft Road.
David Bennett

Section  
Potential land for development 16 - Former Beccles Heat Treatment, Gosford Road, Beccles

Comment ID  
16

Comment  
Development of this site needs to be integrated into an overall development plan for the whole area surrounding site 16. There is an adjacent larger undeveloped site, owned I believe by Roy’s Supermarket, that had planning permission for retail and housing, but this has now lapsed. The surrounding buildings are, in the main, left overs from the previous industrial use of the land, and some are of poor quality. There are existing businesses in these buildings that maybe could be relocated to new retail and light industrial units within a major redevelopment of the whole area encompassed by Fair Close, Gosford Road and the boundary to Roy’s Supermarket. Much of the area is a brownfield site, centrally located within Beccles town and needs to be sympathetically developed to meet a possible combination of housing, retail and light industrial needs.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section Potential land for development 16 - Former Beccles Heat Treatment, Gosford Road, Beccles

Comment ID 999

Comment Partly in Beccles Conservation Area and nearby a number of Grade II Listed Buildings on Blyburgate. Potential impact upon Conservation Area and setting of Listed buildings
Nicky Elliott

Section: Potential land for development 16 - Former Beccles Heat Treatment, Gosford Road, Beccles

Comment ID: 468

Comment: This site has been put forward for housing, but due to its central location, I think it would be much better developed as indoor sports facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 17 - Former Lothingland Hospital Site, Union Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity of The Lodge and The Hall, both grade II listed to the east and ruins of Church of St Andrew also grade II to the west. Potential impact upon the setting of Listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norman Castleton

Section | Potential land for development 17 - Former Lothingland Hospital Site, Union Lane, Oulton

Comment ID | 280

Comment | There is a possible irony here in that a former Hospital Site in being used for housing that would in its self require additional medical facilities. Just like most of the proposals herein around Oulton examples of over development.
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section  Potential land for development 17 - Former Lothingland Hospital Site, Union Lane, Oulton

Comment ID  959

Comment  • Sites not suitable for development:
          17 Former Lothingland Hospital Site, Union Lane
          We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure.
## Potential land for development 18 - Glebe Farm plus adjoining land, Church Avenue, Oulton

**Broads Authority Natalie Beal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 18 - Glebe Farm plus adjoining land, Church Avenue, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Sites 18/53/51 Camps Heath area. There are existing pressures on Oulton Broad marshes relating to land use. I believe there is an article 4 direction on the land now. Additional housing may add to these pressures as well on the marshes as a recreational resource.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environment Agency

Section  Potential land for development 18 - Glebe Farm plus adjoining land, Church Avenue, Oulton

Comment ID  1145

Comment  We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:

Source Protection Zone 3

*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 18 - Glebe Farm plus adjoining land, Church Avenue, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Close to Church of St Michael, grade I listed building. Potential impact upon setting of high grade listed building (though maybe screened by The Spinney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 18 - Glebe Farm plus adjoining land, Church Avenue, Oulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Any development here would have to be carefully landscaped and sited. The area has certain charm and it could easily be spoilt. Would probably add to the strain on services particularly now that a local doctors surgery has gone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 18 - Glebe Farm plus adjoining land, Church Avenue, Oulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Sites not suitable for development: 18 Glebe Farm plus adjoining land, Church Avenue. We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 18 - Glebe Farm plus adjoining land, Church Avenue, Oulton

Comment ID 726

Comment Sites 18; 23; 51; 53 and 96 are in close proximity of areas of sensitive wetland habitat including Oulton Marshes CWS and Dairy Farm Marshes CWS. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact nearby sensitive areas.
Potential land for development 19 - Halesworth Road, Redisham

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 19 - Halesworth Road, Redisham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Church of St Peter Grade I listed to north. Potential impact on setting of high grade listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 19 - Halesworth Road, Redisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The suggestion is that this site could accommodate 6 units which may prove excessive as the amount of land available is very small. We would not be against building here in principle, but there are difficulties as the area, including the adjacent Halesworth road floods regularly. It would be necessary to include significant drainage works to avoid making the current problem worse. An existing problem is the danger faced by motorists turning from the Brampton road into Redisham, particularly those needing to turn North towards Beccles. There is a current need for traffic calming and the problem would get worse with additional housing. We recommend that any plan to develop housing or roads here should incorporate a redesign for this junction - possibly a small roundabout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section | Potential land for development 19 - Halesworth Road, Redisham

Comment ID | 762

Comment | Based on aerial photographs, site 19 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that this site should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that it may have.
Potential land for development 20 - Hall Road, Blundeston

andy Howlett

Section
Potential land for development 20 - Hall Road, Blundeston

Comment ID
289

Comment
Suggest that this is planted as a woodland area to make wildlife habitation. The village of Blundeston will become Carlton Colville if further development is permitted. Just take a drive down The Street in Blundeston along the obstacle course and mish mash of parked cars and current overdevelopment. On the plan so far no account is taken of any future development of the former prison site and the impact this could have. Blundeston is a village – keep it that way. This is simply greed and over development. We strongly object.
### Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 20 - Hall Road, Blundeston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Blundeston House Grade II Listed building to north west. Potential impact on setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Mitchell

Section  Potential land for development 20 - Hall Road, Blundeston

Comment ID  648

Comment  Site 20 suggested for 8 houses viewed in isolation, seems unrelated to the village envelope. If the field surrounding this triangle, extending towards church road, is developed for housing, there could be some clear advantages. Development of this field, in association with the prison site, could be argued as compacting the village. In addition, there is a clear opportunity for planning gain, as parking for the school could be incorporated into the development of this site. Currently, and particularly since the expansion of the school, parking and access problems are a matter of great concern locally. During peak times, Church Road is reduced to a single narrow lane for traffic in both directions. There are near misses, frustrations and congestion on a daily basis.
Potential land for development 21 - Hall Road, Carlton Colville

B Warnes
Wheatman Planning Ltd. (Deirdre Linehan)

Section Potential land for development 21 - Hall Road, Carlton Colville

Comment ID 624

Comment Additional comments on behalf of the landowner:
We wish to submit the following additional comments with regard to Site 21 Land at Hall Road Carlton Colville on behalf of our client Warnes & Sons Ltds who are the land owner and who are renowned and well established local house builders.
We note that the site has scored highly on several of the criteria used to assess the suitability of the site for residential development. In terms of scale and location we consider the site to be one of the most suitable sites put forward for residential development within the Lowestoft area. It is a highly sustainable site well related to the existing built up residential area and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. The site will have excellent access to the many and varied local facilities and services available within Carlton Colville. Furthermore public transport services are within walking distance of the site providing access to additional facilities available within Lowestoft and Beccles. Future occupiers of the site therefore will not need to over rely on the use of private cars for access to everyday needs.
The Council have identified the site as being Grade 1 agricultural land. The approach taken towards agricultural land classification however tends to be very "broad brush" which dates back to pre 1988. Information supplied by Nicholas Rudge of Durrants classifies the site as Grade 2. The land has not been in agricultural use for over 10 years and until 3 years ago had become completely overgrown; it is now being maintained to suppress the brambles and avoid becoming an eyesore again. There would therefore be no loss of land in active agricultural production.
If reliance is to be placed on the Agricultural Land Classification maps virtually all of the land to the south of Lowestoft is either Grade 1 or 2 including several other sites that have been put forward as suggested residential allocations.
The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places great emphasis on sustainable development and it is a fundamental requirement of development proposals that they satisfy the three principles of sustainability, social, economic and environmental as set out in paragraph 7 of the Framework.

Section 6 of the NPPF places a requirement on Local Planning authorities to;
"...use their evidence base to ensure Local Plans meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable ties sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirement with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land..."

Further requirements of the NPPF are the need for sites to be deliverable and developable. To be considered deliverable, "...sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable".

To be considered developable "...sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged". It is considered the site adequately complies with these specific requirements.

The WDC Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment Methodology Consultation Document (Oct 2015) echoes the requirements of the NPPF in terms of assessing whether sites are Deliverable or Developable. In this document:
"deliverable sites" are defined as sites which are suitable, available now and achievable within five years. Site 21 Land at Hall Lane Carlton Colville meets these requirements.

"Developable sites" are described as sites which are suitable with a reasonable prospect that they could be available and achievable within the plan period.

The documents goes on to explain that a site will normally be considered "Available" if the site is within the ownership of a developer who has expressed an intention to develop or sell the land for development. Our client’s land readily meets this requirement.

A site will be considered "Achievable" where there is reasonable prospect that development will occur on the site at a particular time. A key determinant is the economic viability of the site while influences include
market attractiveness, the location of the site in respect of the property market and any abnormal constraints on the site. Carlton Colville has emerged as a highly popular location in which to live in South Lowestoft and commands a strong position in the local housing market. There are no known abnormal constraints on our client's land. We consider therefore the development of this site is achievable.

The adopted Core Strategy (CS) identified a need for 6,960 homes to be built in Waveney between 2001-2025 at an average annual rate of 290/year. The WDC AMR 2014/2015 confirms that the total number of dwellings completed up to March 31st 2015 is in line with the CS requirements although annual completions for the last few years have been well below the annual target of 290.

The new local plan will cover the period up to 2036 and it is acknowledged there is need to plan for significant growth. Waveney’s population is growing and ageing; between 2011 (the date of the last census) and 2036 it is anticipated the population of the District will grow by at least 8000. It has also been identified District will experience net inward migration and also that households are getting smaller. Even with no population growth therefore there is a need to plan for more housing.

The consultation document "Options for the New Local Plan" identifies three different growth scenarios showing different levels of housing and economic growth during the plan period. Annual housing growth could range from 308 dwellings/year, 340 dw/year or 380 dw/year. The consultation document also proposes four different options for how growth and development should be distributed throughout the District with Lowestoft accommodating a minimum of 55% of proposed new development but potentially accommodating up to 75%.

Irrespective of which of the future options for growth outlined in the consultation document is pursued, considerable growth is still expected to take place within Lowestoft, including Carlton Colville and Oulton. This site therefore will make a valuable contribution towards assisting the District Council in meeting their housing targets. The site is well located to the existing built up area of Carlton Colville/ South Lowestoft and will have easy access by foot or bike to a good range of everyday facilities including schools, churches, convenience food shops, employment opportunities etc. It is located in close proximity to bus stops with frequent bus services to Lowestoft and Beccles providing easy access to additional facilities and services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 21 - Hall Road, Carlton Colville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Moated Site Scheduled Monument to east. Potential impact on setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs W Deal

Section  
Potential land for development 21 - Hall Road, Carlton Colville

Comment ID  
254

Comment  
Site number 21 Hall Road Carlton Colville.
The site is proposed as a residential development of approximately 120 dwellings.
Any development on this site would severely impact on the infrastructure of this area of Carlton Colville as follows:
A) Surface Water from approximately 4 Hec would need to discharge into the southern end of Kirkley Stream, a watercourse that has been the subject of regular flooding in The Street & Rushmere Road. Any additional discharge would be contrary to the principles adopted by SCC, Waveney District Council which states "ensure that development avoids areas of risk"
B) Fould drains would discharge into the Anglian Water pumping station in The Street and capacity of the pumps would need to be confirmed as capable of accepting additional flows.
C) Hall road is narrow and congested particularly at school times. Extra traffic would make this situation worse.
D) The local school may find a potential 200 extra pupils a problem not only for teaching but aggravate parking problems and child safety.
In essence this site should not be considered for any kind of development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 21 - Hall Road, Carlton Colville

Comment ID 721

Comment Based on aerial photographs, sites 21; 22; 34 and 98 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.
Potential land for development 22 - Hammonds Farm, London Road, Lowestoft

Bruce Provan

Section Potential land for development 22 - Hammonds Farm, London Road, Lowestoft

Comment ID 532

Comment It is crucially important to keep the buffer between Lowestoft and Kessingland
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 22 - Hammonds Farm, London Road, Lowestoft

Comment ID 722

Comment Based on aerial photographs, sites 21; 22; 34 and 98 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.
Tegerdine  
Ingleton Wood LLP (Sarah Hornbrook)

Section  Potential land for development 22 - Hammonds Farm, London Road, Lowestoft

Comment ID  615

Comment  On behalf of Martin and Lawrence Tegerdine, we wish to support the development of site 22 for housing, in conjunction with site 147 to the immediate south. Together, these sites represent a sustainable and deliverable option for accommodating a significant quantum of the planned growth for Lowestoft, whilst also providing an opportunity to create an attractive, defensible southern boundary to the town through a well-designed Sustainable Urban Extension.

The site is well related to the existing built development of Pakefield, and is contained in landscape terms by the existing development to the east. In terms of accessibility and sustainability, there is an existing footway on the eastern side of the A12 which allows pedestrian and cycle access into Pakefield. The site is also be well-served by public transport, with regular services to Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth to the north and Kessingland and Southwold to the south, running along the A12 London Road. The site is well-located in relation to the existing Primary School in Pakefield, and the new High School which is currently under construction on London Road, approximately 500m to the north of the site. The proposed retail units to the north-west of the site, for which a resolution to approve has been granted, and the existing retail units further south, are readily accessible by foot or by cycle, as are the employment areas to the west.

Contributions to community infrastructure could be secured either through CIL payments, or through on-site provision. Allocation of the site, in conjunction with site 22 of the north, would enable a comprehensive masterplan to be drawn up for a Sustainable Urban Extension to the south of Pakefield, which would consider the provision of all types of infrastructure.

In conclusion, it is considered that development of site 22, together with the north-eastern quadrant of site 147 could provide a considerable quantum of the new homes planned for the District and more specifically Lowestoft, in a sustainable location that is well-related to existing and proposed services and infrastructure and which provides an excellent opportunity to create an attractive entrance into Lowestoft from the south, with a clear and defensible southern boundary to the town. In addition, the
combined sites are capable of providing a significant area of public open space, to the benefit of the wider community, and meeting infrastructure needs either on-site or through financial contributions.
As a long-term resident of the Waveney area, please find below my thoughts/comments on three of the proposed blocks of land:

Site 22 (117 proposed dwellings) – Hammonds Farm
Site 147 (473 proposed dwellings) – Old Rifle Range
Site 98 (54 proposed dwellings) – Rear of Elizabeth Terrace

These three sites provide a fabulous opportunity for different types of housing in South Lowestoft. Each block of land could provide a specific type of housing to meet different needs, and together they would form a diverse development that accommodates residents of all ages. The three sites could be developed as follows:

Site 22 – Affordable rented 1-2 bed apartments
Site 147 – Affordable rented 2-3 bed houses
Site 98 – Affordable rented 1-2 bed retirement accommodation (flats/bungalows)

Sites 22, 147 and 98 are also ideally placed to service this diverse range of residents, and the surrounding amenities would fulfil their requirements and provide a greater quality of life:

1. Close to schools for those with children
2. Close to shops (literally over the road, so can leave car at home and reduce carbon footprint)
3. On main bus route – Lowestoft to the north, and Kessingland/Southwold to the south
4. Close to the beach. This provides a free 'day out' for those with young children, and a pleasant walk in the fresh air for older residents. Many elderly people have mobility issues, and the proximity of the beach to the three sites makes it feasible in terms of exercise and enjoying the natural environment.

This site could also provide an opportunity to provide a new type of private 'rented' property to the residents of Waveney. A large percentage of the population are now priced out of the housing market, and according to The Guardian, 'by 2025, more than half those under 40 will be living in properties owned by private landlords' (2015, see link below).

http://www.theguardian.com/money/2015/jul/22/pwc-report-generation-rent-to-grow-over-next-decade
Unfortunately, many of these people are not only priced out of the housing market, but are also ineligible for Social Housing. This leaves them in a 'no man's land' of private rentals, with little long-term security based on the current practice of 'two months notice' within their tenancy agreements. Could Waveney provide quality and affordable 'private' rental properties that give greater security to tenants? After an initial six months probation within the property, could a longer lease period be agreed between tenant and landlord (say 5-10 years) as they do in continental Europe? This would be beneficial on several levels:

- Landlords have the security of knowing they have a quality tenant in their property
- Tenants have the security of knowing they are not permanently on 'two months notice' within the property.

(This also encourages investment in the property by the tenant (new carpets, decoration etc), that they may not feel committed to make on a short term notice lease)

- Tenants looking to rent for a fixed term (5-10 years) could use that period in an 'affordable' rented property to save up for a deposit on a place of their own. If they subsequently become part of a couple, then a double income can assist in this process

All of the above contributes to a greater harmony in the landlord/tenant relationship, and provides stable and realistic housing opportunities for the residents of Waveney.

I believe that these three sites have fabulous housing potential within the Lowestoft area, and provide a very good quality of life for the future residents who live there.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section  Potential land for development 22 - Hammonds Farm, London Road, Lowestoft

Comment ID  707

Comment  1.0 The "Initial sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" is encouraging in that the only negative points identified relate to
(a)" Conserving and enhancing the quality and distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes"
(b) Conserving Natural Resources
(c) To reduce contribution to climate change and mitigate effects"
With regards to (a) the site is partially Brownfield and there is room to include additional strategic landscaping and open space. With regards to (b) & (c), it is inevitable that there will be negative issues around these based on potential use of greenfield land, but this situation applies to the vast majority of sites being promoted through this land bid exercise.
2.0 The site offer potentially 117 dwellings (LPA estimate) and although largely a greenfield site there is a brownfield element and access road .In any event within the present search for sites , the LPA has recognised that greenfield development is inevitable. This is particularly the case given the lack of progress with regard to delivery of significant amounts of residential development around the Lake Lothing area within Lowestoft. Furthermore the Council predicts that 7700 new homes will be needed up to 2036, which is likely to be a conservative estimate; and therefore there is considerable pressure to release additional housing land. The fact that the Council is still actively seeking further land bids demonstrates this point.
3.0 The site is adjacent to both residential and holiday accommodation to the north and could be built out as a "stand alone" site, without impacting on landscape issues in the area; however there is also scope to look at a consolidated approach with land to the south in separate ownership which is also being promoted and is identified as Site 147.
4.0 Furthermore there is also scope to include Site 98 (in the same ownership as Site 22) to the south of Site 147 to further consolidate the overall area which is already compromised by the presence of S.L.I.E to the immediate west & Pontins to the south, unlike several other potential sites in South Lowestoft which appear to be in more exposed locations on the periphery of the built up area.
5.0 Site 98 would also complement the existing isolated housing in the form
of three terraces facing onto the A12 opposite the S.L.I.E. Indeed the combination of both Sites 22 and 98 could in essence provide a loop road system linking onto the A12 which would maximise the development potential in this area without compromising the limits of the overall settlement area.

6.0 The Council predicts that at least 7700 new homes will be needed between 2011 and 2036. Indeed the LPA recognises that this figure could be as high as 9500; and therefore there is considerable pressure to release additional housing land. The LPA has also indicated that 630 dwellings have been built throughout the district between 2011 and 2015. This equates to 158 per annum. Taking the lower figure above (7700) the requirement is 308 per annum (over the 25 year period between 2011 & 2036), whilst the highest figure represents the need for 380 per year.

7.0 Notwithstanding the fact that there are planning permissions in place for over 3000 dwellings and a further 633 included in allocated sites, nonetheless as illustrated by the Lake Lothing situation, there is some doubt over the ability to deliver the required housing. The fact that the Council is still seeking further sites at present reinforces this position and it follows that there will be likely to be a significant shortfall ;and therefore there is even greater need to promote sites which are available, viable and deliverable in accordance with Para 47 of the NPPF .

8.0 It is understood that there are no viability issues with this particular site and therefore development could be delivered relatively swiftly, and in so doing help to achieve both the Councils required 5YHLS and its Housing Strategy, if supported by the LPA.
Potential land for development 23 - Holly Farm, Wood Lane, Oulton

Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section Potential land for development 23 - Holly Farm, Wood Lane, Oulton

Comment ID 961

Comment • Sites not suitable for development:
23 Holly Farm, Wood Lane
We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 23 - Holly Farm, Wood Lane, Oulton

Comment ID 727

Comment Sites 18; 23; 51; 53 and 96 are in close proximity of areas of sensitive wetland habitat including Oulton Marshes CWS and Dairy Farm Marshes CWS. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact nearby sensitive areas.
## Potential land for development 24 - Homestead Farm, Ringsfield Road, Beccles

### Beccles Town Council C Boyne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 24 - Homestead Farm, Ringsfield Road, Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Whilst the council appreciate the need for development in the area over the next twenty years, it must be handled with great care as the infrastructure in Beccles is at breaking point now, especially the Health Centre. With this in mind, it is felt that any housing development should be restricted to the area to the South West on one or two of the sites numbered 24, 43, 108, 145 and 156, as this makes the best use of the existing and planned road infrastructure. However, this area would require a new primary school and a convenience store and other associated infrastructure to service any expansion. In addition, the two small sites in Beccles, numbers 1 and 16 and site number 60 in Worlingham could also be included as sites for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broads Authority Natalie Beal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 24 - Homestead Farm, Ringsfield Road, Beccles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Group of sites to the south of Beccles – As they are on rising ground, any development proposals would need to be assessed for potential landscape and visual impacts on the Broads area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicky Elliott

Section  Potential land for development 24 - Homestead Farm, Ringsfield Road, Beccles

Comment ID  469

Comment  I have misgivings over the development of this large site, along with sites 156, 43 and 145, as I feel there is no limit to development to the west and south of this area. The sites further east however, are bounded by the Southern Relief Road to the south, and the A145 to the west.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul Leman</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosemary Shaw

Section  Potential land for development 24 - Homestead Farm, Ringsfield Road, Beccles

Comment ID  559

Comment  I am writing with reference to sites 145 and 24. The development of these sites would increase traffic on Ringsfield Road, which the proposed new road linking London Road to the Ellough Industrial Estate would not extend to. Traffic from these two sites would go into the town centre and congestion outside both the schools on Ringsfield Road (Sir John Leman High and St Benet’s primary) would increase. Ringsfield Rd is also part of the national cycle route network (route 1). If Ringsfield road is developed in this way, the logical corollary will be that pressure will mount for a south-western distributor road to link London Rd with the B1062, whereas the whole purpose of the new southern relief road in Beccles is to channel traffic onto the A146.

The most sustainable sites for development are those which would be served by the new road to the south, namely site numbers 8, 9, 81, 82 and 107 - and this would also apply to sites like number 124. It would also make sense if these sites (8, 9, 81, 82, 107) had good cycle paths and walkways into the centre of Beccles even though they would primarily be served by the new southern relief/distributor road for motor vehicles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>484</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>My concerns for this site are as follows; it will have a huge impact on small local roads, Ringsfield rd, South Rd and Ashmans Rd. These roads already have extreme congestion problems at busy school run times with added buses for John Lemon. Also a leisure centre at the Lemon. The junction of Ringsfield Rd and St Mary’s rd is particularly dangerous as visibility is bad. Also there is no capacity for school expansion including nearby Albert Pye as this has already accrued recently. The surrounding roads are choke points with schools and vast number of cars for M&amp;H plastics. I suggest sites 8, 9, 81, 82 and 62 as these would feed onto the new link road and there is the opportunity to build a new school or reinstated Crowfoot school. I would like to see this site used for a camping type holiday place; beautiful countryside, easy bike access, good for links to Halesworth would. Or it would make a good nature reserve thus a tourist destination, and great for families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 25 - Hulver Street, Hulver, Henstead With Hulver Street

Henstead with Hulver Street Parish Council John Armstrong

**Section**  
Potential land for development 25 - Hulver Street, Hulver, Henstead With Hulver Street

**Comment ID**  
1234

**Comment**  
The Parish Council considered the questions you asked it to provide information about. They agreed that the proposed sites for possible development were unsuitable in terms of the number of houses projected for the sites. As I explained in my previous response the Councillors did not feel that they could respond to the other questions about jobs and facilities until after the consultations with residents in the development of the neighbourhood plan.
Moore

Section  
Potential land for development 25 - Hulver Street, Hulver, Henstead With Hulver Street

Comment ID  
511

Comment  
We oppose this site for development of 30 houses as there are no facilities in or near the area and a quiet rural village would be spoilt by over-development. There are no public buses through the village so all journeys would have to be taken by car to Beccles, Lowestoft or Norwich for shopping, leisure, medical facilities etc. Thirty homes could easily involve 60 vehicles and access onto the busy B1127 would cause a lot of problems. There are no schools or doctors in the area and not even a village shop. There is nothing (not even a safe play area) for young children, no pub / entertainment or centre/meeting place for elderly people. We therefore feel development of 30 houses would be totally out of keeping with the quiet countryside area and have a detrimental impact on the surroundings.
Nick Carter

Section: Potential land for development 25 - Hulver Street, Hulver, Henstead With Hulver Street

Comment ID: 501

Comment: I strongly object to the development of this site. The area lies within the AONB and development of the site would be out of proportion to the size of the village. The B1127 is an increasingly busy road especially since the development of the anaerobic digester, building of the crematorium, growth of the parachuting school and expansion of the industrial site and further residential development would make the road busier (there are no bus links in the village) and more dangerous. There is no mains drainage in the village and the development would add to drainage issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 25 - Hulver Street, Hulver, Henstead With Hulver Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>No development of farmland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 26 - Jubilee, Green Lane, Reydon

Anonymous

Section | Potential land for development 26 - Jubilee, Green Lane, Reydon
Comment ID | 1225
Comment | Key Questions Q5 Are there any areas of land you think are suitable or not suitable for development? Reydon - Rissemere Land and Easton Bavents are unsuitable - also the field across from Keens Lane. Could perhaps add some houses near Pitches View.
Clive Tickner

**Section**  
Potential land for development 26 - Jubilee, Green Lane, Reydon

**Comment ID**  
103

**Comment**  
Hugely inappropriate area as it now has a only single house and a caravan parking area. The small amount of traffic that the caravan drivers present is often more than sensible for a narrow lane. Most of the land is outside the village limits and is in a sensitive AONB. The quiet nature of this part of Reydon would be totally overwhelmed. 36 homes on such a small space must also conflict with the allowable area per dwelling.
Historic England Debbie Mack

**Section**  
Potential land for development 26 - Jubilee, Green Lane, Reydon

**Comment ID**  
1005

**Comment**  
Grade II* Church of St Margaret to West. Limited potential for impact on Listed Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jim Elmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs McNally

Potential land for development 26 - Jubilee, Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID 212

Comment

We attended the meeting on Tuesday 10 May to view the Waveney Local Plan. We were surprised to see so many homes planned for Reydon. Is there really a need for this amount of extra housing in this area? We asked the Planning Officer if the necessary infrastructure would be put in place prior to or at the same time the homes would be built. We were shocked to be told that this would not be the case and their remit was just to built houses and there was no link up with any necessary services. We pointed out that there are currently long waiting times for appointments at the Health Centre and treatment times at the James Paget A&E are below targets. The Planning Officer said that shortage of doctors is a nationwide problem and any improvements needed cannot be part of the housing development plan. There also appears to be no firm plans proposed for more school places, jobs, shops, sewage capacity etc. for the 972 homes mentioned.

It would appear that the area will be overdeveloped to provide housing with no thought for the well being of existing or new residents. Surely this cannot be right and we are writing to ask what action you will be taking. There is also the concern that a lot of the new property will be second homes and holiday lets and wonder if you will be considering adopting the St Ives ruling of not allowing this type of person to purchase new properties. This would make it less attractive to developers to build such large housing developments.

One last point when does a village enlarge so much to qualify to become a town?
Comment ID
611

Comment
I object to 'Jubilee' land being used for development as it runs along, adjacent to Rissemere Lane East, a quiet single track country lane not wide enough for two cars, an AONB area, is part of the cycle route, used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and children accessing the recreation ground and childrens play area, all needing safety along the lane. This lane has already had several attempts from planning to construct including Pathfinder, relocating Easton Bavents residents and most recently from Global chair components which has been turned down at appeal. Why should up to possibly 36 houses be allowed on the other side of the lane, completely spoiling the very nature of this leafy unspoilt area?
Pippy Tickner

**Section**
Potential land for development 26 - Jubilee, Green Lane, Reydon

**Comment ID**
183

**Comment**
This land is outside the village perimeter of Reydon and as such is in protected AONB land & in a locally loved area known as Reydon Smere, making it unsuitable for building outside the village boundary. This privately owned large plot with a family home has a maturing developing woodland planted on it some 15 yrs. It currently has use for a countryside leisure activity of occasional holiday camper van use, max 6 vehicles. which fits happily with the sensitivity of this area. The plot protrudes hugely into the special area of The Smere & runs beside a designated ‘Quiet Lane’ surrounded by agricultural fields. Change of use of this agricultural land to building plots (or indeed of the adjacent 2 plots 5 & 38..similarly placed) would set a precedent for change of use land which is given Government protection to be only altered for development on in proven exceptional circumstances. There is no need for such designation as there are other plots identified here between Wangford Rd & Halesworth Rd, as well as land not shown in this area which had been identified & discussed during the Pathfinder project as previously proposed suitable for building.

As the immediate Southwold/ Reydon area is a major tourist area with the majority of ANY new build being snapped up for holiday rental or second home use. Previous attempts to protect new build homes, only to be purchased by local people, have failed dismally and seen only the developers profit hugely from these developments. Any proposals for change of use of this protected AONB land would be highly detrimental to this area and not provide affordable housing for the Suffolk area which would need to be more appropriately placed nearer to towns with existing facilities for schools etc & with better transport links for the communities living there.
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 26 - Jubilee, Green Lane, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>In Reydon, we believe that at Elliott Avenue and off Mount Pleasant there are two small infill sites which could be designated for affordable housing. We believe that the site identified as Jubilee, Green Lane (site 26), adjacent to the site already identified for affordable housing, is suitable for a mixed development of affordable and low cost housing. The site of the temporary pharmacy adjacent to Reydon Health centre should be developed, either for housing or mixed uses. Depending on the density of development, these sites could meet the target. Other potential sites for modest extension of the settlement of the village are the land adjacent to the Crescents (where road layout confirms an earlier intention to extend the development there) and the land on either side of Wangford Road from the existing housing towards the Church. The Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to meet Planning Officers to explore further these potential sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ruth & John Pigneguy

Section

Potential land for development 26 - Jubilee, Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID

172

Comment

Many residents have moved here to live in a semi-natural area. These sites look like massive over-development. Second homes need to be controlled so that we can have local full time residents living here.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

**Section**
Potential land for development 26 - Jubilee, Green Lane, Reydon

**Comment ID**
596

**Comment**
This site is on the edge of the settlement of Reydon and adjacent to the site in Green Lane already agreed for a small development of affordable housing under the current Rural Exceptions policy (DM22). There are also three houses on the corner of Green lane and Rissemere Lane East which this site surrounds. It is, however, in the open countryside and part of the AONB. Despite this, we believe that this site could be considered for small-scale development, of affordable housing and/or lower cost smaller units of commercial housing. These are the types of housing needed to meet local need and we recognise that modest expansion of the village envelope of Reydon may be needed to develop such housing.

Small-scale development such as this will be adequate to meet the targets for new housing in Southwold and Reydon if the option to concentrate growth in the area in and around Lowestoft is adopted as we have supported elsewhere.

Any development here must be planned carefully to minimise its impact on the visual amenity and environment of the AONB and work will be required on the infrastructure, particularly the sewage system which is at or beyond its capacity in the whole area of Southwold and Reydon but specifically beyond its capacity in this part of Reydon. A footawya will also be required on the part of Rissemere Lane which would be developed under this proposal.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section  Potential land for development 26 - Jubilee, Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID  753

Comment  Sites 5; 26 and 38 are in close proximity of Benacre to Easton Bavents SPA and Pakefield to Easton Bavents Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on either the SPA or the SSSI.
Potential land for development 27 - Land (off) The Loke, Blundeston, Blundeston

**Comment**
Suggest that this is planted as a woodland area to make wildlife habitation. The village of Blundeston will become Carlton Colville if further development is permitted. Just take a drive down The Street in Blundeston along the obstacle course and mish mash of parked cars and current overdevelopment. On the plan so far no account is taken of any future development of the former prison site and the impact this could have. Blundeston is a village – keep it that way. This is simply greed and over development. We strongly object.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>John Mitchell</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lisa Doylend

Section  Potential land for development 27 - Land (off) The Loke, Blundeston, Blundeston

Comment ID  893

Comment  With comment to the option of sites that housing has been proposed for in our village, I seriously think that our small village roads cannot cope with the extra volume of traffic. Sites 42, 27, 129, 29 should definitely be ruled out.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lisa Doylend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tim caley

Section
Potential land for development 27 - Land (off) The Loke, Blundeston, Blundeston

Comment ID
300

Comment
This is green belt land. Blundeston has a huge pending development site at the prison site. There is no infrastructure in the village to support the present expansion let alone more building. Blundeston has no shops, doctors surgery or dentist and has a school which is already oversubscribed. All local roads are small and dangerous with numerous blind bends and hidden entrances and exits. Further increases in traffic will increase deaths and or serious injuries. Roads are in an appalling state of repair and are constantly clogged with school traffic.
Rosalind Roots

Section  Potential land for development 27 - Land (off) The Loke, Blundeston, Blundeston

Comment ID  885

Comment  Sites 129 and 27 are close to fields and hedges where wildlife would be threatened. We are presently blessed with an abundance of wildlife, that I have recently been able to photograph, like hares, rare butterflies, deer, and varieties of birds including species on the decline like skylarks and cuckoo. It is a peaceful area enjoyed by the villagers and it is hoped that these sites will not be chosen.
Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

andy Howlett

Section  Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID  290

Comment  Suggest that this is planted as a woodland area to make wildlife habitation. The village of Blundeston will become Carlton Colville if further development is permitted.

Just take a drive down The Street in Blundeston along the obstacle course and mish mash of parked cars and current overdevelopment.

On the plan so far no account is taken of any future development of the former prison site and the impact this could have.

Blundeston is a village – keep it that way.

This is simply greed and over development.

We strongly object.
Bruce Rayner

Section Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 398

Comment Site 29

Plan indicates that housing demand may exceed supply and that there may be a requirement for a further 8,000 homes before 2036. Before large areas of the locality are built upon, are the Council certain of the requirement? It would seem irresponsible to build numerous ‘white elephants’. Is this not merely a function of the Government’s policy to build a specified number of homes but without certainty of the need in this area?

Plan indicates that there are already 3,141 new homes in the pipeline plus a further 633 anticipated. That would seem to be enough for the present until precise requirements are known.

a) Most employment is South of the river. Blundeston is to the North.
b) Transport in Blundeston is poor, there is bad road access and it is dangerous even with low traffic. Sites 164-165 are better served.
c) Site does not benefit from obvious safe and easy access.
d) Why spoil such a beautiful area, enjoyed by tourists, local runners and cyclists? Further traffic would be a hazard.
e) As a Chartered Surveyor, your numbers per hectare do not appear to be accurate.
f) There are no amenities in Blundeston, not even a village shop for milk, bread, etc.
g) There is no regular bus service. Increased traffic to get in and out of the village is an environmental issue. Areas identified South of Lowestoft are already served by public transport and allocated safe cycle routes.
h) Properties in Blundeston are mature. New homes next to what are already new homes in Carlton Colville would be much better.
i) By publishing this document, you seem to have added planning blight to nearly all of the homes surrounding Lowestoft for no apparent reason.
j) Building 456 new homes in Blundeston would almost double the population of the village, surely not desirable, sensible or necessary.
k) Current essential services / supply are limited. At certain times of the day, water pressure is already very low.
l) Risk of flooding through rainfall if a concrete jungle is built - sewers can’t cope.
m) Broadband is slow and mobile phone signal is bad.
n) Development on the prison site is already ample for the village to cope with.

o) Blundeston is inhabited by lots of wildlife - there are owls, newts, hedgehogs, etc. I've heard baby owls calling to their parents from our house. Some of these species are becoming rare. Why destroy these areas when there are alternatives? It makes far more sense to build on the sites identified in Carlton Colville. The proper infrastructure could be put in place in one designated area. Why spoil beautiful landscapes, upset huge numbers of the local population and potentially decrease tourism and enjoyment of the areas outlined.
Gary Shilling

Section Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 378

Comment As outlined in my local village news letter (Blundeston) I would like to register my rejection to any large scale building (sites 29, 42, 63 & 129), in my opinion the village neither has or has the ability to enable a construction on these scales. We have neither the roads to handle the increased traffic (roads not in a good state of repair or wide enough, concerns for children around the village as no road has a cycle lane or footpath), the school could not accommodate an increase, no local facilities and simply no need. It is nice to remain a village and not end up becoming part of oil ton broad as outlined village has done! I have no objection to small (under 10) development that allow the village to absorb the impact that it would have. I understand this is a biased view, but like everybody whom lives here, we picked it because it is a small village. This is mind with the development on the old prison site and other sites (that have been constructed and are just footings in the ground) the usual infill sites have been enough. The development on the prison will increase the traffic in and out of the village hugely as most households have two cars if not more, and that with children staying at home for longer traffic will increase without further building. T can already be seen throughout Lowestoft, Blundeston aside people are increasing parking on the road instead of using garages of changing front gardens to off road parking which should be implemented to remove cars parked on roads to increase road safety. Sorry didn't mean to turn into a rant.
Gary Shilling

Section Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 581

Comment Not suitable as village infrastructure not capable of sustain a development of this size, i.e drainage (already an unsolved problem), roads (too narrow and un paved for pedestrians),
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section | Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID | 1006

Comment | Church of St Mary grade I, Pound grade II and the Rookery grade II. Potential impact on setting of high grade Listed Building and other listed buildings.
John Mitchell

Section  Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID  649

Comment  Site 29 suggested for 25 houses would appear to have a problematic access. It is difficult to envisage where an access could be formed without destroying the leafy nature of these roads. Both Pound Lane and Church Road are narrow, and visibility is very restricted. On street parking has added to this problem, particularly given the LPA's decision last year to permit further properties, some effectively without on-site car-parking. On-street parking associated with the school extends the entire length of Church Road almost to the junction with Short Road/The Street. It is hard to imagine how this site could be accessed until such time as adequate alternative parking provision is made at the school.
Lisa Doylend

**Section**  
Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

**Comment ID**  
895

**Comment**  
With comment to the option of sites that housing has been proposed for in our village, I seriously think that our small village roads cannot cope with the extra volume of traffic. Sites 42, 27, 129, 29 should definitely be ruled out.

Site 29 – Church Road and Pound Lane cannot cope with the school traffic, let alone an extra 50 cars (2 per household).
Metka UK Ltd Matthew Jary

Section
Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID
7

Comment
As the owner of The Rookery, Pound Lane, Blundeston I would like to strongly object to the inclusion of the above site in the Local Plan. My property was formerly the parish Rectory and Parsonage associated with St Mary's Church in Blundeston, owned by the church the curtilage was parcelled with plot 29 and another paddock alongside. It was split into three in the 1970's, the church retained plot 29, the paddock and house were sold separately and I purchased the house in 2006.

The Rookery is unique in its setting because it is Grade II listed by English Heritage as the birthplace of Charles Dickens' character David Copperfield in the book of the same name. Blundeston's main claim to fame is this very fact. Not only is The Rookery accurately described in the first two chapters of the book when the story takes place in the village, but also the views around and the particular views of the church from the house windows are detailed famously. All of these would be compromised by development on plot 29 severely damaging this very important local Heritage Asset. Many local roads, businesses, buildings and societies take their very name from the historical connection and importance of The Rookery, Dickens and David Copperfield and development of plot29 would damage their origin and severely restrict Waveney's historic environment.

I would also argue that this part of Blundeston is particularly unsuitable for further development for the following reasons:
1. It is greenbelt land rather than brownfield.
2. Current development is limited around the site and services are poor.
3. Proximity to the Millennium Green would compromise the ecological and aesthetic environment.
4. Already the Blundeston Primary School is full to overflowing and each day at peak times car parking along Church Road, Pound Lane and Dickens Court is illegal and dangerous. It is a matter of time before a child is killed, and extra development on this road will only make demand higher and traffic even busier. Parents speed up Pound Lane at the moment so increased housing will only increase traffic.

I am not against all potential development in Blundeston because there are merits to sites 27/129 and 42 which are nearer to the amenities of the village, and also the main A12. Sites 20, 49 and 63 are too far from anything
to be seriously considered and would constitute massive detriment to the greenbelt village is included in the plan. All these proposed sites are greenfield sites where the most obvious candidate nearby for any development would have to be the former HMP Blundeston, which should be prioritised over all others in it service provision, brownfield condition, low environmental and ecological impact, and need for an alternative use. However there is much argument to keep all development away from Blundeston because it should not be categorised as a 'larger village' along with Corton, Kessingland and others.

1. Blundeston is not as close to the main conurbation as the other villages.
2. Blundeston does not have enough amenities to qualify as a 'larger village' - no shops, no post office, no banks, one pub.
3. Services to the village are too poor to provide for a large increase in development.
4. Access and roads are particularly poor in, around and to the village.
5. Parking is usually on-road making access even more difficult throughout.
Michaela Jary

Section | Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID | 203

Comment | I would like to object to this application on the grounds that it will severely damage the habitats for a number of rare and endangered species of wildlife, as well as massively affecting the character of one of the most historic buildings in our region.

We live in the Rookery, surrounded on two sides by this piece of land, and the literary birthplace of David Copperfield and once visited by Charles Dickens. The house’s historical character will be all but destroyed by a large development alongside, blocking all views of the church. Houses alongside would be looking directly into our property and ruining our privacy.

Since we have lived in the Rookery we have been inundated with beautiful wildlife which will disappear with any development. Over the ten years we have lived here, we have found two types of newts, a number of toads, frogs, snakes, slow-worms as well as a variety of small mammals such as mice, shrews and rabbits. The land in question is a nightly hunting site for any number of bats, and a pair of stunning Barn Owls. Numerous other birds are always present and we have even had larger mammals such as Muntjak deer, stoats, weasels and foxes sighted.

All of this will be lost with a development of this scale. On top of this, the school cannot deal with the extra pupils or the extra traffic which is already at unsafe levels and will almost certainly lead to a major accident in the very near future.

This site is unsuitable in many ways and should not be considered for development.
Mr and Mrs D Tantony

Section Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 701

Comment SITE 29
In response to your Waveney local plan and how it affects Blundeston Area. As attached your plan document;
The heading should have read. How to devastate Blundeston a rural village.
We totally object to all the proposed possible options being submitted for future planning.
The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered: Some are on a greenfield site used by many villagers and tourists for recreation and walking dogs, and building here would both diminish the striking view of the village.
Facilities Services and infrastructure, we have one Public House, One School, Monday to Friday only, busses have been cut to 3 traveling to Lowestoft, and 3 to Lound, off which only 2 go to James Paget Hospital that’s our services.
All roads and footpath are very much in need of upgrading, as some have none at all?
452 houses proposed 2 cars per house hold, meaning increase of 904 or more cars in the village, as we have no other means of transport for going to work or general shopping. The impact on this village would be devastating. Knowing that we speak for the majority of the people living in Blundeston.
As your comments and recommendation below would agree we us and nothing have change to date.
Small Bere is a dispersed settlement where development proposals should be considered very carefully: infilling could ruin the character of the village while estate development would overwhelm it. The protection of Small Bere’s visual historic and archaeological qualities should be supported by Planning Policy’s.
Issue January 2010, Waveney Local Development framework. As stated in your Documentation,
All thou referent numbers not matching your new site referent number, some of these sites are reference in this document, copied and paste.
Site: 007 Land at Pound Lane/Church Road, Blundeston
Respondent: THE/569/1787
Representation: These representations in respect of the Waveney Local Development Framework Site Specific Allocatio

Document, Lowestoft Area Section are submitted on behalf of our client, The Diocese of Norwich. The Council will be aware from previous submissions that the Diocese of Norwich are the owners of Site 007 - Land at Pound Lane / Church Road, Blundeston. The Core Strategy confirmsthat somehousing development shouldtake place at the Larger Villages. The Council consider that sufficient brownfield land has been identified to accommodate the proposed levels of housing development at the larger villages. However, housing requirements are minimum requirements and that the site presents the opportunity to provide development, which could support or provide new services in a location, which is accessible by public, transport and therefore to higher order services in Lowestoft. We therefore consider that provided that development of the site can address all site-specific issues that have been identified, there is no reason as to why the site could not be allocated for housing development within the Submission version of the Site Allocations document.

In terms of site-specific issues, the Council's analysis identifies that there are significant landscape and building conservation considerations, which apply to the site. We are of the view that development of the site should not be ruled out at this stage, without having undertaken further analysis of these issues. It may be possible to address these issues through sensitive development of the site. Sensitive development of the site might also ensure a scale of development to which the Highways Agency have no objection (Please see representation on file for full comments).

Assessment: While it is agreed that sensitive design and layout of new development can overcome impacts on the historic landscape, site 007 is located on greenfield land beyond the built up area and therefore contrary to the aims of Core Strategy. Development of this scale is inappropriate in a village where there are few services and facilities to sustain the community. In line with previous recommendations the site will not be taken forward.
Mr and Mrs D Tantony

Section Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 702

Comment SITE 29
In response to your Waveney local plan and how it affects Blundeston Area. As attached your plan document;
The heading should have read. How to devastate Blundeston a rural village.
We totally object to all the proposed possible options being submitted for future planning.
The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered: Some are on a greenfield site used by many villagers and tourists for recreation and walking dogs, and building here would both diminish the striking view of the village.
Facilities Services and infrastructure, we have one Public House, One School, Monday to Friday only, busses have been cut to 3 traveling to Lowestoft, and 3 to Lound, off which only 2 go to James Paget Hospital that’s our services.
All roads and footpath are very much in need of upgrading, as some have none at all?
452 houses proposed 2 cars per house hold, meaning increase of 904 or more cars in the village, as we have no other means of transport for going to work or general shopping. The impact on this village would be devastating. Knowing that we speak for the majority of the people living in Blundeston.
As your comments and recommendation below would agree we us and nothing have change to date.
Small Bere is a dispersed settlement where development proposals should be considered very carefully: infilling could ruin the character of the village while estate development wouldoverwhelm it. The protection of Small Bere’s visual historic and archaeological qualities should be supported by Planning Policy’s.
Issue January 2010, Waveney Local Development framework. As stated in your Documentation,
All thou referent numbers not matching your new site referent number, some of these sites are reference in this document, copied and paste.
Site: 005 Market Lane, Blundeston
Respondent: WEL/436/1004
Representation: As with site 006 we feel that it is item of contention that this site is noted once again as Greenfield Land. Surely the documented past use of the land confirms that it is indeed a Brownfield Site. Please give further consideration be given to both sites and at the very least our comments are noted for consideration for the future should 1st East fail to deliver the housing that is being forecast. Assessment: Comments noted. The site is not consistent with the Core Strategy. The road network is poor and facilities within the village are inadequate to support growth at this scale.

Recommendation for Site No: 005 Site 005 is located on land beyond the built up area of Blundeston. While some development will be permitted in the larger villages, location of new housing will be restricted to the main towns. Blundeston has good access to services in Lowestoft but the village has very limited facilities and poor road network for development of this scale. Allocation of this site would be contrary to Core Strategy policies CS01 and CS11 relating to sustainable development. As already recommended the site will not be taken forward.

Respondent: WEL/436/1003

Representation: It was with interest to note that this site was referred to as Greenfield land once again, as it was quite clearly listed as Brownfield when planning was approved under the Rural Exceptions Policy. We would ask you to consider the remaining parcel of the site as a preferred option with this in mind. We would ask that our comments are noted for consideration for the future should 1st East fail to deliver the housing that is being forecast. Assessment: Comments noted. The site already has planning permission for 10 affordable dwellings. As this site is located beyond the built up area. Any additional need for affordable housing could be addressed through rural exceptions policies. Therefore there is no need to progress this site further.

Recommendation for Site No: 006 As with Site 005, site 006 are located on land beyond the built up area of Blundeston. While some development will be permitted in the larger villages, location of new housing will be restricted to the main towns. Blundeston has good access to services in Lowestoft but the village has very limited facilities and poor road network for development of this scale. Allocation of this site would be contrary to Core Strategy policies CS01 and CS11 relating to sustainable development. Any proposals for affordable housing could be considered under the rural exceptions policy. As already recommended the site will not be taken forward.
Peter Carrier

Section Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 458

Comment Holy unsuitable sites for such massive builds, there is inadequate infrastructure (sewage, utilities and roads) such a project would ruin the outlying area, in addition This would take away good agricultural land growing food, a consideration for lowering the imports and potential local economy issues with the EU.
Tim caley

Section  Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID  299

Comment  This is green belt land. Blundeston has a huge pending development site at the prison site. There is no infrastructure in the village to support the present expansion let alone more building. Blundeston has no shops, doctors surgery or dentist and has a school which is already oversubscribed. All local roads are small and dangerous with numerous blind bends and hidden entrances and exits. Further increases in traffic will increase deaths and or serious injuries. Roads are in an appalling state of repair and are constantly clogged with school traffic.
Pamela Robertson

Section Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 304

Comment Blundeston already has inadequate infrastructure - there are problems with the sewer, pipes being too small - problems with water drainage - parking problems in the street.
Our village has always been a peaceful tranquil place where one can talk a walk and hear birdsong and see the occasional deer and small animals on the fields - this is what most of the residents enjoy and the general feeling of the villagers is that if all the proposed building takes place it will be detrimental to this area.
I have lived in Blundeston for many years and within my lifetime much infill building has taken place - there are now to be additional houses on the prison site which will mean additional traffic to the school.
I would also like to include sites 42, 49, 63 and 129 with my comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>simon bunting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terry Gooding

Section Potential land for development 29 - Land adjacent Millennium Green, Church Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 347

Comment Blundeston cannot support a development of this size, there simply isn’t the infrastructure to justify it. Destruction of greenfield sites, over subscription of essential services such as schools and doctors, the fact that roads will become busier and more dangerous as a result. Increased risks of flooding due to concrete coverage.

As a wider concern I do not see plans for new hospitals, fire stations, police stations, doctors, school or public transport

Why is the redevelopment of the prison site not included here which in itself will contain at least 100 houses - will this offset your need to build all over Blundeston & ruin yet another beautiful village. People live here to escape the sprawl not live on a housing estate.

I appreciate that housing is required but not on this scale and any planning application of this nature will be opposed by all who live there.
Potential land for development 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane, Wangford with Henham

Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK Hannah Lorna Bevins

Section Potential land for development 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane, Wangford with Henham

Comment ID 1142

Comment The following sites have been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/HP apparatus:
* 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane
* 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road
* 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road
* 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane

National Grid Gas Distribution would like to take this opportunity to advise prospective land developers and the local authority of the following:
Crossing of assets: Construction traffic should only cross the pipeline at locations agreed with National Grid. To facilitate these crossings protection or diversion may be required; depending on site condition and pipe parameters.

Cable Crossings: For all assets, the contractor/developer will need to consider the clearance and necessary protection measures. The crossing must be perpendicular to the asset. The crossing may require a deed of consent to be agreed prior to work commencing.

Piling: No piling should take place within 15m of gas distribution assets without prior agreement from a National Grid Representative.

Pipeline Safety: National Grid will need to ensure that access to the pipelines is maintained during and after construction.

Our HP/IP pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation to be monitored by a National Grid representative. Ground cover above gas distribution mains should not be reduced or increased. Our MP/LP mains will not be as deep as the pipelines.

A National Grid representative may be required to monitor any excavations or any embankment or dredging works within 3 metres of a HP/IP pipeline.
or within 10 metres of an Above Ground Installations (AGI). Monitoring of works in relation to MP/LP assets may be required by a National Grid representative. National Grid steel pipelines are cathodically protected to prevent corrosion to the pipeline. For further information please refer to SSW/22 (see further advice section below). If you require any further information in relation to the above please contact National Grid's Plant Protection team via the email address at the top of this letter.

Appendices - National Grid Assets

Please find attached in:

* Appendix 1 provides maps of the sites referenced above in relation to the affected National Grid Gas Distribution (Intermediate Pressure /High Pressure) assets outlined above.

(map enclosed)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane, Wangford with Henham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Is the best site for new housing in Wangford?  
Is the current sewage system capable of supporting 130 new houses?  
Why build houses outside the village envelope next to the A12 when other possible land is closer to the centre of the village. Consider south of Hill Road and behind existing houses in Norfolk Road. This would allow access for parking to the rear of those properties which would improve the traffic situation on Norfolk Road.  
Would a dangerous access need to be created on the A12?  
How could any new housing be protected from becoming second homes? |
Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane, Wangford with Henham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Elm Farm house and Malting, both grade II listed buildings to south of site. Potential impact on setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lloyd Scriven

Section                  Potential land for development 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane, Wangford with Henham

Comment ID               53

Comment                  This proposed development would be totally inappropriate for the village of Wangford for the following reasons:
The proposed site is in an AONB
The proposed site is completely outside the existing current physical village limits, even if the village limits were to be more loosely defined, the vast majority of this site would still be well outside the village limits.
The existing local plan suggests 'small' amounts of development – this proposal is not in any way small
The infrastructure in the village does not support this level of development
This is a greenfield site – preference should be given to brownfield sites
The road network around this site cannot support this proposed development
Baker

Section  
Potential land for development 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane, Wangford with Henham

Comment ID  
66

Comment  
We feel this site is quite unsuitable for the proposed housing: access is challenging from minor roads, a recently laid water main to supply Southwold with water transects the site and the aesthetics of this side of the village would also be compromised. The housing would significantly detract from the current properties as well as considerably increasing the traffic on roads quite unsuitable
Potential land for development 31 - Land adjacent to Little Priory, Church Street, Wangford

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 31 - Land adjacent to Little Priory, Church Street, Wangford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Located in the Conservation Area, adjacent to grade I listed Church of St Peter and St Paul as well as a range of grade II listed buildings including Little Priory, former Coach House, The Vicarage, the Well Cottage, Baxter House and a number of other properties to the north. Potential impact on Conservation Area and high grade and other listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 32 - Land adjacent to The Oaks, Beccles Road, Holton

Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section  Potential land for development 32 - Land adjacent to The Oaks, Beccles Road, Holton

Comment ID  843

Comment  Sites 32, 103 and 148 are Holton.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 32 - Land adjacent to The Oaks, Beccles Road, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Pastures Farm grade II listed to north. Potential impact on setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 32 - Land adjacent to The Oaks, Beccles Road, Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 32 is well outside any village envelopment on a busy, narrow road with no natural links to other development of significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 33 - Land adjacent to Travelodge Hotel, Leisure Way, Lowestoft

Gunton Woodland Community Project Barry Shimmield

Comment ID 671

Comment

I am writing on behalf of the Gunton Woodland Community Project. We would like to comment on an item in your "Potential Sites for Development" listing in which you have included Site 33 (0.72ha) with a theoretical potential for 22 dwellings. We do not believe this is a suitable site for a dense housing development and set out below our reasons for this.

Originally, this site was part of the land to the South of Leisure Way that had been purchased by Tesco in order to construct a Petrol Filling Station. At a public meeting in 2000, GWCP urged Tesco to consider releasing some of the remaining land for use as a Nature Reserve and, after 2 years of negotiations with continuous involvement of GWCP, Tesco agreed to this proposal. Another 4 years passed before all the legal agreements were finally in place and in 2006 Suffolk Wildlife Trust were able to take ownership of more than half of the land to establish the Gunton Meadow Nature Reserve, see attached map. Subsequently, Planning Application (DC/11/1376/FUL) for a Nursing Home on Site 33 was submitted by Frostdrive & Brookdale House. It was approved in 2012, but the permission has now expired.

As is evident from the map, Site 33 forms a critical link in the "green belt" surrounding North Lowestoft that stretches from the beach all the way through the Denes, Dip Farm golf course, Gunton Wood, Pleasurewood Hills meadow, Gunton Meadow Nature Reserve to Foxburrow Wood and thence to the West of the A12. There is an increasing understanding of the importance of maintaining such continuous corridors for the benefit of wildlife. Moreover, immediately adjacent to Site 33, there is a large natural pond which is well known as a great-crested newt habitat. Indeed, the presence of G C newts was responsible for delaying the construction of the Travelodge hotel for several months while mitigation procedures were implemented.
Gunton Meadow Nature Reserve is an important asset to the area with its wide variation of habitat, two ponds, interesting ground flora and a great deal of bird life. It is well maintained by Suffolk Wildlife Trust, supported by an enthusiastic team of volunteers and, an ideal outcome for Site 33 would be to incorporate it as a part of the Reserve. If the environmental case for this was presented to the Owners of the land we wonder whether they could be persuaded to follow the precedent set by Tesco with a demonstration of philanthropy by gifting the land to Suffolk Wildlife Trust for the benefit of residents and visitors to Lowestoft.
Of course, this may be wishful thinking and if the Owners insist on a financial return we believe it might still be possible to find a solution. If a suitable Developer could be found, one way forward might be to create an "adventure playground" attraction for children based on outdoor activities. Such a facility may prove to be very successful financially. Pleasurewood Hills is already a family destination, the Harvester Restaurant and Travelodge Hotel are close by so there are good prospects for high numbers of visitors. Even with a small refreshment cafe and provision for car parking it should still be possible to plant a significant number of trees and shrubs across the site in order to preserve its green credentials.
There may be other acceptable uses for the site, any of which would be preferred over tightly packed houses and/or flats with virtually no green spaces.
We are copying this letter to Suffolk Wildlife Trust in case they wish to express their views on this proposal.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd (Jenny Moor)

Section
Potential land for development 33 - Land adjacent to Travelodge Hotel, Leisure Way, Lowestoft

Comment ID
519

Comment
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd's Statement dated June 2016 should be referred to for full details relating to the suitability of Site 33 for allocation for residential development for approximately 20 new homes. The site is also referred to as 'Land south of Leisure Way'.

Site 33 is conveniently located to the north of Lowestoft, approximately 2 miles (3.2km) from the town centre, where a significant number of shops, services and employment opportunities are located. Lowestoft is the main town in the District and has historically been the focus for growth. The site is not currently identified within the 'physical limits' for Lowestoft, as defined by the Adopted Proposals Map, and is therefore considered to be located within the 'countryside' in policy terms. However, the site which was previously consented for a leisure centre and an 80-bed residential care home, clearly forms part of the existing planned built up area. It effectively comprises a remaining vacant and unused parcel of land, with Tesco Supermarket located to the north beyond Leisure Way, Travelodge Hotel and a Public House located to the west and designated open space located to the south and east. The site essentially relates to the urban area. Consequently, the existing physical limits boundary is out-of-date and requires updating in this regard.

The site is located within close proximity to existing and established residential areas to the west and south of the site. The principle of development on the site has been established with planning permission granted for an 80-bed care home in 2012. The permission was not implemented although recognised the appropriateness of the site for development. Prior to the care home consent, planning permission was also granted in 2006 for a leisure development on the site as part of the wider Tesco retail complex.

In terms of flood risk, the site is entirely contained within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore not considered to be at risk from surface water flooding. An appropriate drainage strategy will be incorporated into any development proposal for the site.

The site contains no known heritage assets, ecological designations or other physical constraints that would prevent development. There is an existing
gas main running north-south in the western part of the site and a tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Any development on the site could be adequately designed around the gas main and TPO.

All the key services and facilities are accessible via a regular public transport bus network (with the exception of Gunton Primary School, although it is expected that this would be accessed by walking or cycling due to its close proximity to the site). The site is well connected to existing cycle routes and all the identified key facilities are within cycling distance. A significant number of the key facilities are also within reasonable walking distance of the site. The site is clearly sustainably located.

There are bus stops located directly opposite the site on Leisure Way. A number of regular services are provided to Lowestoft Town Centre, Southwold, Great Yarmouth, Norwich and Martham. There is also a more limited weekday bus service running to the James Paget Accident and Emergency Hospital.

In terms of rail provision, Oulton Broad North Station is 2.4 miles and Lowestoft Train Station is 3 miles, from the site. Rail links are provided to Norwich and Ipswich, where connecting services are provided to destinations further afield such as central London. There is a regular bus service from Leisure Way to Lowestoft Train Station.

In summary, the site forms an integral part of the established built up area on the edge of north Lowestoft, with excellent pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to nearby shops and other key community services. Therefore, residential development in this location would represent a suitable and compatible land use.
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd Jenny Moor

Section

Potential land for development 33 - Land adjacent to Travelodge Hotel, Leisure Way, Lowestoft

Comment ID

1192

Comment

1. Introduction

1.1 This Statement sets out representations made by Lawson Planning Partnership Limited on behalf of our Client and site owner Frostdrive Limited, in relation to the development of land south of Leisure Way, Lowestoft for residential purposes for approximately 20 homes. This Statement has been produced in response to both the 'Options for the new Waveney Local Plan' (April 2016) and the latest 'Call for Sites' (April 2016, following the previous Call for Sites exercise in Autumn 2015).

1.2 In January 2016 the site was submitted to Waveney District Council as part of the previous 'Call for Sites' exercise. The Council has now published all of the sites that were submitted for public comment, as part of the 'Options' for the new Waveney Local Plan. The site is included within the Options for the new Waveney Local Plan as 'Site Number 33 - Land adjacent to Travelodge Hotel, Leisure Way, Lowestoft'.

1.3 As part of this consultation, Waveney District Council are undertaking a further Call for Sites exercise. Our client’s land south of Leisure Way has been resubmitted as part of this latest consultation, with further details contained within this Statement to reiterate the suitability of this sustainable site for residential development.

1.4 Representations are also made relating to a number of the questions set out in the 'Help plan our future - Options for the new Waveney Local Plan' consultation document. These are set out at Section 5 of this Statement. Responses have also been uploaded to the Waveney Consultation Portal.

1.5 This Statement provides detail to the Council on why the site south of Leisure Way should be allocated for residential development.

1.6 In summary, the proposed allocation of land south of Leisure Way, Lowestoft represents a suitable and sustainable location to accommodate a small but important residential development that would assist the Council in meeting its overall housing requirement for the District, including affordable housing, for Lowestoft in particular.

1.7 It is therefore requested that the Council takes into consideration our comments and ultimately includes the site as a housing allocation in the emerging Local Plan. It is understood from the Council's Local Development
Scheme (March 2016) that the new Local Plan is currently anticipated to be Adopted in May 2018. The site is available for development now, and prior to the Adoption of the Plan, and therefore the site's suitability and deliverability for housing development should be recognised in the early stages of the plan preparation process.

2. Background to the Site

2.1 The site comprises land to the south of Leisure Way, Lowestoft, as shown on the Site Location Plan at Appendix 1. The site covers an area of approximately 0.8 hectares (2 acres), comprising a relatively flat and open area of vacant land.

2.2 The site is conveniently located to the north of Lowestoft, approximately 2 miles (3.2km) from the town centre, where a significant number of shops, services and employment opportunities are located. Lowestoft is the main town in the District and has historically been the focus for growth.

2.3 The site is not currently identified within the 'physical limits' for Lowestoft, as defined by the Adopted Proposals Map, and is therefore considered to be located within the 'countryside' in policy terms. However, the site which was previously consented for a leisure centre and an 80-bed residential care home, clearly forms part of the existing planned built up area. It effectively comprises a remaining vacant and unused parcel of land, with Tesco Supermarket located to the north beyond Leisure Way, Travelodge Hotel and a Public House located to the west and designated open space located to the south and east. The site essentially relates to the urban area. Consequently, the existing physical limits boundary is out-of-date and requires updating in this regard.

2.4 The site is located within close proximity to existing and established residential areas to the west and south of the site.

2.5 As explained above, the principle of development on the site has been established with planning permission granted for an 80-bed care home in 2012. The permission was not implemented although recognised the appropriateness of the site for development. Prior to the care home consent, planning permission was also granted in 2006 for a leisure development on the site as part of the wider Tesco retail complex.

2.6 In terms of flood risk, the site is entirely contained within Flood Zone I and is therefore not considered to be at risk from surface water flooding. An appropriate drainage strategy will be incorporated into any development proposal for the site.

2.7 The site contains no known heritage assets, ecological designations or other physical constraints that would prevent development. There is an existing gas main running north-south in the western part of the site and a
tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Any development on the site could be adequately designed around the gas main and TPO.

2.8 The site is situated in a sustainable location with key services and facilities located within convenient walking distance, as identified on the Facilities Map at Appendix 2. The site adjoins existing designated open space to the south, which provides a pedestrian right of way directly to Gunton Primary School. The accessibility of the site to many local services is further demonstrated in the table below. There is a good and accessible public footpath network in the vicinity of the site and Leisure Way links to a national cycle route. The site is well-linked to Lowestoft Town Centre which is located 2 miles to the south.

Table showing access to key facilities from the site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctors Surgery, Alexandra Road NR32 1PL</td>
<td>2.2 miles (3.5km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft Hospital, Tennyson Road NR32 4AT</td>
<td>2.2 miles (3.5km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Practice John G Plummer &amp; Associates, Meadow Road, Oulton NR32 3AZ</td>
<td>1.5 miles (2.4km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office 65-67 Hollingsworth Road NR32 4AT</td>
<td>1.1 miles (1.8km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco Superstore Leisure Way NR32 4TZ</td>
<td>0.1 mile (0.2km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Potters Kiln Public House, Leisure Way NR32 4TZ</td>
<td>0.1 mile (0.2km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunton Primary Academy School, Gainsborough Drive NR32 4LZ</td>
<td>0.25 miles (0.4km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Benjamin Britten High School, Blyford Road NR32 4PZ</td>
<td>0.8 miles (1.3km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft North Quay Retail Park, Peto Way NR32 2ED</td>
<td>2.3 miles (3.7km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterlane Leisure Centre, Water Lane NR32 2NH</td>
<td>1.7 miles (2.7km)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9 All the key services and facilities are accessible via a regular public transport bus network (with the exception of Gunton Primary School, although it is expected that this would be accessed by walking or cycling due to its close proximity to the site). The site is well connected to existing cycle routes and all the identified key facilities are within cycling distance. A significant number of the key facilities are also within reasonable walking distance of the site. The site is clearly sustainably located.

2.10 There are bus stops located directly opposite the site on Leisure Way. A number of regular services are provided to Lowestoft Town Centre, Southwold, Great Yarmouth, Norwich and Martham. There is also a more limited weekday bus service running to the James Paget Accident and Emergency Hospital.

2.11 In terms of rail provision, Oulton Broad North Station is 2.4 miles and Lowestoft Train Station is 3 miles from the site. Rail links are provided to Norwich and Ipswich, where connecting services are provided to destinations further afield such as central London. There is a regular bus service from Leisure Way to Lowestoft Train Station.
2.12 In summary, the site forms an integral part of the established built up area on the edge of north Lowestoft, with excellent pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to nearby shops and other key community services. Therefore, residential development in this location would represent a suitable and compatible land use.

3. Development Proposals

3.1 As explained in Section 2, the site provides the opportunity to deliver much needed housing on a vacant development site within a sustainable location, as part of a logical extension to this part of the town.

3.2 Housing market advice has been sought and the client’s intention is to bring forward a housing development within the next 12 months. A consultant team has been appointed to undertake the technical work to support a related planning application.

3.3 The site is suitable for housing and is capable of delivering approximately 20 new homes. The proposed development density would be compatible within the existing prevailing residential pattern within the area. Development of the site would be compatible with the area and would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of any neighbouring properties. The site is well located to promote healthy living and provides good access to open space benefiting from its proximity to designated open space to the east and south.

3.4 The site is solely owned by Frostdrive Ltd and is available for development within the short term. Housing development could therefore be delivered within the first five-year period. In summary, the land at Leisure Way is an available, developable and deliverable housing site. representing sustainable development.

4. Call for Sites Pro-Forma

4.1 To accompany these Representations a further 'Call for Sites' pro-forma has been completed and is attached at Appendix 3.

Potential Land for Development - North Lowestoft Area

5.37 Our client's site is included as potential land for development in the North Lowestoft Area and is identified as Site 33 on the Map at page 47 of the consultation document.

5.38 It is clear from the map that there is an absence of sites within the proximity of our client’s site, particularly to the south towards Lowestoft town centre. This indicates that there is a lack of other suitable sites for development within the area and as such the land to the south of Leisure Way is sequentially well located. Our client’s site is very well related to the existing urban area and should be allocated for residential development in the emerging Local Plan.

Sustainability Appraisal
5.39 As part of the Evidence Base to the emerging Waveney Local Plan, the Council have undertaken, and published as part of the consultation, their 'Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options'. This appraises each of the sites previously submitted to the Council, including our client's site at land south of Leisure Way. The site is referred to in the Sustainability Appraisal as 'Site Option: 33 Land adjacent to Travelodge Hotel, Leisure Way, Lowestoft'.

5.40 The assessment of the site demonstrates that the site would largely have either positive effects or no effect, when considered against the different sustainability objectives, demonstrating the site's high sustainability credentials.

5.41 However, it is considered that some of the comments made are inaccurate or incomplete. It is noted that Sustainability Objective 9 'to conserve and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes' is indicated to have a negative effect. It is stated that the development could look imposing and be poorly related to existing housing, and be out of character within the townscape of the area. We entirely disagree with this view and when considering Objective 9, it appears that the Council have not given consideration to the established principle of residential use on the site through the granting of planning permission for the 80-bed care home and the leisure related development as part of the wider retail complex associated with the Tesco superstore. The site is well related to the urban area and it is requested that the Council re-consider their response to Objective 9.

5.42 Sustainability Objective 10 'to reduce contributions to climate change and mitigate effects' has also recorded a negative effect. However, whilst the sustainability of the site in relation to cycling is recognised, there are also a number of key services and facilities, such as shops and a primary school, within walking distance of the site and there is a regular bus service operating opposite the site from Leisure Way. The accessibility of the site to footpaths and the existing bus network should also be recognised by the Council as they also reduce contributions to climate change.

5.43 Sustainability Objective 11 'to conserve natural resources' states that the site would have a negative effect because it is undeveloped greenfield land. Whilst the site does comprise greenfield land, the site is a sustainable and suitable site for residential development located within the urban area, which has previously been granted planning permission for residential and leisure developments.

5.44 Sustainability Objective 17 is to 'encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth'. The Council's comments refer to the site having poor accessibility to employment areas. The site is
approximately 2 miles to the north of Lowestoft Town Centre where there are a wide range of employment opportunities. The site is sequentially very well located to the town centre and the existing bus network provides regular links and good accessibility to the employment opportunities located there.

6. Summary and Conclusions

6.1 These representations respond to the Waveney District Council 'Options for the New Waveney Local Plan' Consultation and demonstrate that the site comprising land south of Leisure Way, Lowestoft represents a suitable, accessible, available and deliverable housing allocation within a sustainable location.

6.2 The site is capable of delivering a relatively small (approximately 20 units), but valuable contribution to the requirement for market and affordable housing within the District and could be delivered within the first five years of the Local Plan period.

6.3 The site comprises currently vacant land which benefits from expired planning permissions for a residential care home development and could be put to a more beneficial use following a Local Plan housing allocation. A leisure based planning application was also approved for the site which did not come forward. However, the principle of built development on the site has therefore been clearly established.

6.4 There are a lack of suitable sites for development between our client's land and Lowestoft Town Centre and the land is sequentially well located. This is a sustainable site situated in close proximity to key services and facilities that can be accessed by foot, cycle and public transport. There are positive environmental, social and economic benefits associated with the redevelopment of the site for housing which justify its inclusion as an allocation for much needed housing in the emerging Waveney Local Plan. It is therefore requested that the site is allocated for a modest residential development of approximately 20 dwellings.

6.5 It is trusted that the comments made within these representations will be taken into consideration in the preparation and drafting of the next stages of the emerging Local Plan.

(Attached: Site location plan, facilities map, updated call for sites pro forma)
Raymond Adcock

Section  
Potential land for development 33 - Land adjacent to Travelodge Hotel, Leisure Way, Lowestoft

Comment ID  
341

Comment  
I wish to comment on the land off Leisure Way where 22 houses are planned. I consider this area to be unsuitable for 22 houses. The area of land adjoins the Gunton Meadow Nature Reserve and the pond by the development area has always been a breeding ground for great crested newts. On looking at Natural England’s web site, areas that are known to contain the great crested newts have to have a buffer from that area to the nearest building. This does in fact, limit the area of land for building quite considerably.

Also there is a wonderful oak tree on that piece of land. I am not aware if this tree has a TPO placed on it, but if not it should be protected. It would be criminal if this tree was taken down. This again limits the area of land for building.

If one looks at the situation of this land, it really is not conducive for housing.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 33 - Land adjacent to Travelodge Hotel, Leisure Way, Lowestoft

Comment ID 725

Comment Site 33 is adjacent to Gunton Meadow nature reserve, which is owned and managed by Suffolk Wildlife Trust, supported by local volunteers, the reserve supports a variety of protected species and Priority habitats and species. Site 33 has previously had consent for built development (a care home) and a number of ecological issues have arisen as the result of site clearance that has previously occurred in relation to this. It is noted that the site is now proposed for allocation for residential development, with an indicative density of 22 dwellings. Gunton Meadow is part of a network of small wildlife rich habitats in north Lowestoft which form an important ecological network in the area. Whilst it is understood that some form of development has previously been considered acceptable on this site, we do not consider that residential development of the density identified in the Local Plan consultation is appropriate. Preferably, the site should not be allocated for any built development. However, if it is determined that some form of residential development is deliverable it must be ensured that it is of low density and includes substantial buffers of both the nature reserve to the east and the green space to the south.
# Potential land for development 34 - Land at Bell Farm (primary area), Carlton Colville

**Adam Skinner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 34 - Land at Bell Farm (primary area), Carlton Colville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>i think this is suitable land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environment Agency

Section  
Potential land for development 34 - Land at Bell Farm (primary area), Carlton Colville

Comment ID 1172

Comment  
Carlton Colville and the Kirkley Stream in general are known to suffer from flooding from both the Kirkley Stream and surface water sources. The potential development sites numbered 34 & 35, as well as the much large proposal for residential development linking the A12 and the A146 could offer the opportunity to reduce the existing flood risk and implement some of the early concepts that have been produced for public consultation as part of the Lowestoft flood risk management strategy. In addition, the management of surface water from any future developments in this area will need to be strictly controlled, and ideally consider opportunities to reduce flood risk to existing communities. It will be essential for you to discuss this with Suffolk County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic England Debbie Mack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs W Deal

Section Potential land for development 34 - Land at Bell Farm (primary area), Carlton Colville

Comment ID 256

Comment This site would need to drain into Kirkley Stream which regularly causes flooding in the area. A proposal for 150 dwellings could cause further flooding problems. Access is presumed to be onto The Street where parking is a problem and a new junction would aggrevate highway safety in the area. Can local schools and amenities cope with further development in this area? This appears to be a site which where development conflicts with council polices which seeks to "ensure that developments avoids areas of risk"
**Norman Castleton**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 34 - Land at Bell Farm (primary area), Carlton Colville

**Comment ID**  
323

**Comment**  
Far too much development in the area already and any more will exceed services and communications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tim Meadows
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section  
Potential land for development 34 - Land at Bell Farm (primary area), Carlton Colville

Comment ID 705

Comment  
The "Initial sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" paper is encouraging in that the only negative points identified relate to:
(A) "reducing contributions to climate change and mitigate effects"
(B) "Conserving natural resources"
In response to items (A) and (B), considering Site 34 is Greenfield land, it is often the case that potential issues can be identified in relation to these matters, however given the scale and situation of the site, and it’s proximity to Site 35 to the west (which we have also submitted on behalf of our client), we believe that a potential development could be designed to involve particular features and infrastructure improvements to mitigate and counteract these potential issues.
The site extends to approximately 5 hectares and could accommodate up to approximately 150 dwellings (based on an assumed 30 dwellings per hectare). The site is within the sole ownership of our client and is considered suitable, available and deliverable in the next 1-5 years.
The site is accessible via Low Farm Drive, and there is also potential to create an access from The Street, over Site 35 to Site 34, if there is a requirement for a more substantial road connection into the site. Site 35 benefits from an approximate 50 meter road frontage on to The Street.
Development of the site would represent a logical extension to the south of Carlton Colville. It is abutted by residential development to the north and the east. As mentioned previously within this representation, the land to the west is also owned by our client.
Given the site’s situation, we believe that it’s development would certainly be suitable as it is easily serviceable and accessible. It is within cycling and walking distance from Lowestoft, a key area for prospective employment growth over the coming plan period.
Subsequent to the previous narrative, we consider the site to represent a sustainable opportunity for development and we look forward to continued engagement with the emerging Local Plan process in relation to this site.
Potential land for development 35 - Land at Bell Farm (secondary area), Carlton Colville

Environment Agency

Section  Potential land for development 35 - Land at Bell Farm (secondary area), Carlton Colville

Comment ID  1173

Comment  Carlton Colville and the Kirkley Stream in general are known to suffer from flooding from both the Kirkley Stream and surface water sources. The potential development sites numbered 34 & 35, as well as the much large proposal for residential development linking the A12 and the A146 could offer the opportunity to reduce the existing flood risk and implement some of the early concepts that have been produced for public consultation as part of the Lowestoft flood risk management strategy. In addition, the management of surface water from any future developments in this area will need to be strictly controlled, and ideally consider opportunities to reduce flood risk to existing communities. It will be essential for you to discuss this with Suffolk County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic England Debbie Mack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
kathryn bradley

Section  Potential land for development 35 - Land at Bell Farm (secondary area), Carlton Colville

Comment ID  527

Comment  Carlton Colville has seen enough development. This site was rejected from the last local plan because of flooding problems. What has changed? It is agricultural land and new homes could be better sited elsewhere.
Mr & Mrs W Deal

Section  Potential land for development 35 - Land at Bell Farm (secondary area), Carlton Colville

Comment ID  257

Comment  A development of potentially 320 houses on this site would cause additional flooding problems in Carlton Colville. This is a major concern both locally and downstream of the proposed site. Extra strain on congested roads, local school & infrastructure in the area.
Potential land for development 36 - Land at Cromwell Road and London Road, Weston

Nicky Elliott

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 36 - Land at Cromwell Road and London Road, Weston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>I feel this land should not be developed, as it is well beyond the southern boundary of the town, away from services and facilities, and is not bounded to the south.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 37 - Land at Dukes Bridge, Beccles Road, Bungay

Anonymous

Section Potential land for development 37 - Land at Dukes Bridge, Beccles Road, Bungay

Comment ID 214

Comment Places labelled 55, 37 on the Bungay development map are areas not very well set up with infrastructure, they include already very built up urban areas. With this the land on St Johns Hill (45) would better be suited for housing and other leisure facilities.
### Environment Agency

**Section** Potential land for development 37 - Land at Dukes Bridge, Beccles Road, Bungay

**Comment ID** 1154

**Comment** We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:
- Partly in Flood Zone 3
- *Flood Zone – A floodplain is the area that would naturally be affected by flooding if a river rises above its banks, or high tides and stormy seas cause flooding in coastal areas.*

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 37 - Land at Dukes Bridge, Beccles Road, Bungay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Dukes Bridge House, Barn and wall all Grade II to the north. Potential impact on setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Lavery

Section Potential land for development 37 - Land at Dukes Bridge, Beccles Road, Bungay

Comment ID 151

Comment This site seems to have a major drainage issue with a watercourse going through and/or adjacent to the site. Considering the recent furore(s) about building on flood plains this area seems a dead duck for housing and/or a care Home from the outset.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Peter Norman</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 37 - Land at Dukes Bridge, Beccles Road, Bungay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Based on aerial photographs, sites 37 and 55 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 38 - Land at Green Lane, Reydon

Anonymous

Section  Potential land for development 38 - Land at Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID  1226

Comment  Key Questions Q5 Are there any areas of land you think are suitable or not suitable for development? Reydon - Rissemere Land and Easton Bavents are unsuitable - also the field across from Keens Lane. Could perhaps add some houses near Pitches View.
Clive Tickner

Section  
Potential land for development 38 - Land at Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID  104

Comment  
Wholly inappropriate development on farmland. Outside the village limits. Occupies a large part of our AONB. Creating a new village within a village. Current infrastructure unable to cope. Traffic problems will occur due to the few roads that lead from the A12 to Southwold.
## Environment Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 38 - Land at Green Lane, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Over an historic Landfill Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 38 - Land at Green Lane, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Grade II*Church of St Margaret to West - potential impact on setting of LB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jim Elmes

Section: Potential land for development 38 - Land at Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID: 159

Comment: Off Green Lane is the most appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mr &amp; Mrs McNally</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crook

Section: Potential land for development 38 - Land at Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID: 614

Comment: I do not see how Green Lane could cope with possibly 211 new house/businesses (sites 5/38/26), one end Green Lane/ Wangford Road has a very dangerous corner entrance/exit with traffic unable to properly see around corner, the other end Green Lane/ Rissemere Lane East/ Cox's Lane/ Covert Road has a dangerous crossroads with Cox's lane used as a 'rat run' to the Lowestoft Road, this already causes problems as it is a narrow road, with such a possibly large increase in traffic both residential and business this would only make the situation worse. Also why should office/storage or distribution be allocated to this site not at the industrial site area with other businesses, infrastructure in the Green Lane area could not cope.
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Potential land for development 38 - Land at Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID 1131

Comment [Therefore,] none of the proposed large sites offered for development around Reydon (5,6,38, 117,18,138 in the options consultation, p51) will be needed and we believe these should not be considered for designation as development sites in the final Local Plan. Our residents strongly opposed the expansion of the village envelope in their response to the consultation for our Village Plan in 2014 which was confirmed more recently in the public response to the current application to develop land at St Felix School (site 138). There is simply no case for major development of housing or business accommodation on any of these sites, given the analysis of the housing needs set out above and the availability of undeveloped land at the current Reydon Business Park.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section: Potential land for development 38 - Land at Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID: 598

Comment: This site is wholly unsuitable and inappropriate for development. It is outside the boundary of the settlement of Reydon and in open countryside which is part of the AONB. The local roads are unsuitable for the significant increase in traffic which would result from this development, especially heavy goods traffic that would be generated by the proposed business uses. The sewage infrastructure, especially in this part of Reydon, is already beyond its capacity and this is a further reason for rejecting this proposal. Development on this scale is not needed in Southwold and Reydon to meet the targets for new housing if the option to concentrate growth in Lowestoft is adopted as we have elsewhere argued for economic and regeneration reasons. There are other sites which could meet the local housing target by small scale developments which would not impact heavily on the countryside or cause undue strain on the infrastructure. There is unused land on the Reydon Business park for business and light industrial development.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 38 - Land at Green Lane, Reydon

Comment ID 754

Comment Sites 5; 26 and 38 are in close proximity of Benacre to Easton Bavents SPA and Pakefield to Easton Bavents Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on either the SPA or the SSSI.
Potential land for development 39 - Land at Grove Farm, Bungay

Allen Harradine

Section: Potential land for development 39 - Land at Grove Farm, Bungay

Comment ID: 625

Comment: Saw this Map 39 today following a conversation with Robin Cook and later Dickon Povey both of whom were very helpful. As the proposed development appears to be adjoining our perimeter we should be grateful if you would add our email address to your database and keep us advised of any future consultations or any matter regarding Map 39.

Best wishes
Jean Harradine
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section: Potential land for development 39 - Land at Grove Farm, Bungay

Comment ID: 849

Comment: Site 39 – Housing development at this location has the potential to impact adversely on both the landscape character (LCA 2) and the visual amenity of the users of the Broads. Any scheme at this location would need to be sensitively designed to ensure that potential impacts are assessed and mitigated through a suitable layout and the provision of adequate vegetation buffers both on the northern boundary and within the site as it is located on rising ground. Street lighting and other above ground utilities may be an issue as well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Agency Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 39 - Land at Grove Farm, Bungay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints: Partly Source Protection Zone 1 with the other after in Zone 3 and within Drinking Water Protection zone *Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment). <a href="http://apps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/37833.aspx">http://apps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/37833.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Henderson

Section  Potential land for development 39 - Land at Grove Farm, Bungay

Comment ID  56

Comment  This site is currently agricultural land with heavy clay soil, which is generally used for arable crops. The site is situated on a steep bank 0-30m rise (estimated from OS map contours) across the site. Land at the top of the site regularly has standing water on the fields and within the drainage ditches.

The road to the south of the site (Annis Hill), which would appear to provide the access to the main part of the proposed site is a single track road of less than 4m wide. There is no passing place on the hill and there is limited visibility of vehicles approaching from outside the town (down the hill). In the last 6 months 4 residential properties on the other side of the road have been built with drives that exit directly on to the road.

Currently, the road provides a route to 20-30 properties in the parishes of Mettingham and Ilketshall St John, along with access for agricultural vehicles servicing the surrounding land. The road is also used regularly by local runners and cyclists for leisure activities and is a highly used route for numerous local dog walkers, as it provides easy access to the countryside for residents on the estates either side of it.

During winter periods Annis Hill routinely has water flowing down it due to the higher elevation land either side of it using it as the main overflow route for land drainage. There is no drainage ditch either side of the road and the breadth of the road is restricted by residential properties already in existence further down the hill.

Over the last 5 years the road has been subject to numerous patch road repairs due to the effect of this flooding and resultant frost erosion. Similar repairs have been required to the telephone / broadband infrastructure which is located part way up the hill.

Electricity supplies beyond the estates at the bottom of Annis Hill are supplied via overhead lines. There is no main gas supply beyond the current residential estates, nor is there mains sewerage beyond this point either.

Whenever, agricultural land is to be given a change of use to a residential area, it the following must be considered:

(1) Is the site suitable for the proposed development?
(2) Is the access to the site suitable to meet the increased traffic requirements of the number of homes to be developed.
(3) Will the increased traffic flow cause a significant detrimental effect to
(4) Is the current infrastructure suitable to support the increased usage demands?

(5) Does the benefit of the extra homes outweigh the loss of the agricultural land?

Taking each of these points in turn:

(1) The proposed use of the site is for 207 nursing / care homes. It is highly questionable whether a site of such a steep elevation is anyway suitable for the proposed use, as residents of such properties are likely to have reduced or poor mobility. Anybody who has walked or cycled up Annis Hill would know that it is not easy to climb.

(2) Annis Hill is very simply a county lane. In its present form it is not suitable to take the increased traffic flow the proposed number of properties would generate. The width, condition and visibility of the road all provide significant limitations for access and given the residential properties that are already in existence it is difficult to see how the road could be widened and improved to the required standard.

(3) Runners, cyclists and dog walkers all use Annis Hill for leisure activities, due to the fact that it is a quiet road leading out into the countryside. The increased traffic flow is likely to put an end to this leisure use. It is also a concern that agricultural traffic that regularly moves to and from farms further down in the town to those outside of the town will struggle to pass a regular flow of cars on the hill, resulting in obstruction, congestion and damage to the countryside either side of the road.

(4) If the site is to be developed, a significant extension and upgrading of all forms of utilities and infrastructure would need to be undertaken. Mains gas supplies and sewage would need to be extended and overhead electricity and telephone lines would need to be upgraded. In particular the flooding / land drainage will need to be addressed as a priority. Currently the land drainage that is in existence is not working (as evidenced by the regular overflow onto the road). This issue will be only exacerbated by the development.

(5) This a difficult point to make a judgement on and the artificial division in infrastructure / property planning between different levels of local and national government makes such considerations harder. The growth in population in the UK means that more homes are required. There is no point arguing on a not in my backyard basis. However, as a country we also need to ensure long-term sustainable food production for our future population. If we rush to convert agricultural land to residential use, we solve one immediate problem only to create a potentially more devastating one.
Given all of the above, I do not believe that the site suggested is suitable for the proposed use. If this land is to be developed for residential use the I believe significant thought must be given and legally / contractual protection put in place to ensure that the required road access and utilities / infrastructure are developed to support it. There will also need detailed thought to be given whether the services that in existence within Bungay at present are sufficient to support the increased elderly or disabled population (depending on the nature of the proposed residential properties) the development represents.
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section | Potential land for development 39 - Land at Grove Farm, Bungay

Comment ID | 955

Comment | • Sites suitable for development:
| 39 Land at Grove Farm
Sarah Brown

Section Potential land for development 39 - Land at Grove Farm, Bungay

Comment ID 495

Comment From my perspective developing this site in untenable. There are several reasons for this, as outlined below:
* Both potential points of access to the site are unsuitable; Annis Hill is a fairly steep narrow country lane. It is not wide enough for 2-way traffic and the entire lane is not visible until drivers/ pedestrians are on the brow of the hill. This currently puts vehicles and pedestrians at risk, at best means cars frequently have to reverse to create passing space, at worst results in accidents (I'm aware of several that have happened there, one involving the hospitalisation of an elderly gentleman and the death of his dog); Beccles Road is already very busy and is downhill and on a bend, traffic rarely reduces speed to 30mph by the time it reaches the bend on the approach to the town. It can be very dangerous trying to enter or exit the driveways for the houses, numbers 122 - 130 Beccles Road. Due to the increasingly heavy traffic along Beccles Road the two right turns at the old Watchhouse have also become increasingly difficult to negotiate. Extra traffic here would be undesirable and make that stretch of road more dangerous.
* There is no mains drainage along the eastern end of Beccles Road. 122-130 Beccles Road are on septic tanks and we believe there are others. This makes the sewage management of mass housing incredibly difficult.
* The hill that this site is on is made of sand. Sand can be an unstable material to build on and the builders of our property reported several challenges during construction due to the sheer amount and depth of the sand.
* Concreting over the land above our property as necessary for new buildings could lead to run-off which would travel down-hill to the gardens below, one of which being ours. This causes a potential flooding and land slide risk to our property.
* The current infrastructure cannot sustain an increased population in the town; there are too few resources in Bungay to support the population already here, e.g. Doctor appointments, dentist appointments, parking availability in the town, school spaces etc.
* Currently the approach to Bungay from the Beccles direction is attractive and unspoiled. Development would spoil this and would be highly visible from the road. It would be an eye-sore that could not blend in with its surroundings due to the height of the land; it would be too high a skyline.
for this side of the town.
* One of the reasons we bought 128 Beccles Road was the appeal of the rural aspect directly behind the property and the quiet that comes with this. Housing on this site would obviously spoil that for the properties here and will mean we are over-looked, an issue to which we are very strongly opposed.
* We also anticipate that this will decrease the value of our house; when we purchased our home, this potential development had not been proposed.
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Section Potential land for development 39 - Land at Grove Farm, Bungay

Comment ID 1209

Comment Subject to further assessments through the planning process, the proposed level of development is acceptable in principle. However, access constraints are likely to be identified on site 39; any proposed access onto Annis Hill would require widening the road due to its narrow width, this site should provide its main access from B1062.
Tracey Holmes

Section Potential land for development 39 - Land at Grove Farm, Bungay

Comment ID 127

Comment I live in Throckmorton Rd directly down the hill below where this proposed development would be. My objections are
1. That Annis Hill is a very busy road and that it narrows considerably near where this development is proposed. I would not welcome even more traffic along both Annis Hill and Hillside Rd East.
2. I would be very concerned about drainage and the dispereement of any rainfall off a concreted over area such as this directly up the hill from me. A relative of mine had rain run off a farm field (and that's without it even being concreted over, which would surely be much worse) straight though her house and I would be concerned about this from such a development. I have been concerned aobut this even before such a development as the drains directly above where i live are never cleared out properly and are always blocked with litter, so in addition to the water running off a concreted development, there would be nowhere for it to get away, except to pour into my garden
3. I would also be very sad to see those fields built on, as many people including myself, from the neighbouring estates spend time up there walking and biking - there is a lovely view across the valley - and in my opinion that area should be preserved. There are very few areas in Bungay where you can go for a quiet walk without to much traffic and this is one of them.
### Potential land for development 40 - Land at Laurel Farm, Hall Lane, Oulton

**Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 40 - Land at Laurel Farm, Hall Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

We have already placed before you the virtues of each of the sites which we have submitted and make the point that, in the event of allocation, we are in a position to bring each forward for development within the early years of the plan.

Each is well located in relation to existing built development and can proceed without reliance on others.

Site 40 off Oulton Road relates well to the development to the south, presently under construction by Persimmon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**       | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints: Source Protection Zone 3  
*Source Protection Zone* - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).  
**Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 40 - Land at Laurel Farm, Hall Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | • Sites not suitable for development:  
40 Land at Laurel Farm, Hall Lane  
We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure. |
Potential land for development 41 - Land at London Road (former Ashley Nurseries site), Kessingland

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section | Potential land for development 41 - Land at London Road (former Ashley Nurseries site), Kessingland

Comment ID | 1119

Comment | We have already placed before you the virtues of each of the sites which we have submitted and make the point that, in the event of allocation, we are in a position to bring each forward for development within the early years of the plan. Each is well located in relation to existing built development and can proceed without reliance on others.

We note that site 41 in Kessingland is put forward for a mixed use development in the Kessingland Neighbourhood plan – we will be making representations of support of this to the plan hearing, but we will have to point out that the aspirations set out in the plan, in terms of a mixed use, cannot be accommodated at the scale proposed. There is insufficient space for the quantities of development suggested and in addition we conclude that the cross subsidy of starter units by residential, in the manner proposed, is not viable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 41 - Land at London Road (former Ashley Nurseries site), Kessingland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Adjacent to Pond Farmhouse grade II listed. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jo Thompson

Section
Potential land for development 41 - Land at London Road (former Ashley Nurseries site), Kessingland

Comment ID
480

Comment
I am disappointed to see that this is the only site in Kessingland that coincides with the Kessingland Village Plan. While this site occupies part of the 'Strategic Gap' that was designed to prevent the further expansion of Kessingland towards Pakefield/Lowestoft, I accept that as a brownfield site change of use is now almost automatically achieved.

This was also the site identified by Kessingland Parish Council after consultation with residents as the 'least of all evils' as a development site as it is currently derelict.

Having said that, it has serious issues with drainage that the developer would need to rectify before proceeding.

I would also note that the village plan designates this site for starter homes and light industrial units not just houses as in the Waveney plan. The village plan is keen to ensure that an already overdeveloped village builds in sustainability in any new developments. We do not wish to become solely a holiday and retirement village with no scope or opportunity for our residents. The only housing 'need' there is in the village is for affordable homes, which the Village Plan addresses (in addition to the Ashley site) comprehensively by use of Laurel Farm land to the south and east of Ashley's.

This also relates to our already overstretched drainage and sewage which is a serious issue on this site as well as generally throughout Kessingland. Further development here will also require addressing issues of traffic, parking and speed, which are already serious issues and concerns in London Rd.
Mary Hill

Section Potential land for development 41 - Land at London Road (former Ashley Nurseries site), Kessingland

Comment ID 64

Comment It appears that you have marked land on London Road, next to 109 and in front of Pond Farm as potential building land. This field is a green field site, and has not been offered up for redevelopment. Originally this land was all part of Ashley Nurseries, but was broken up and sold off many years ago, at least 30 years that I know of. This field is all part of the Strategic Gap promised by Waveney Council that would remain to keep Kessingland a separate village from Pakefield. There is no mention of redevelopment in our Local Plan. I would also like to mention that I do not like the idea of Ashley Garden site being redeveloped for housing as this too will begin to fill the Strategic Gap.

Thank you Mary Hill
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section: Potential land for development 41 - Land at London Road (former Ashley Nurseries site), Kessingland

Comment ID: 763

Comment: Based on aerial photographs, sites 41; 85; 109 and 119 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.
Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

andy Howlett

Section: Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID: 291

Comment: Suggest that this is planted as a woodland area to make wildlife habitation. The village of Blundeston will become Carlton Colville if further development is permitted. Just take a drive down The Street in Blundeston along the obstacle course and mish mash of parked cars and current overdevelopment. On the plan so far no account is taken of any future development of the former prison site and the impact this could have. Blundeston is a village – keep it that way. This is simply greed and over development. We strongly object.
Andy Howlett

Section  Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID  296

Comment  Object.
Already to much traffic in the village.
The structure of the village cannot sustain the additional traffic that a
development of this size will create.
It will destroy the nature of the village.
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section  Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID  1120

Comment  We have already placed before you the virtues of each of the sites which we have submitted and make the point that, in the event of allocation, we are in a position to bring each forward for development within the early years of the plan. Each is well located in relation to existing built development and can proceed without reliance on others.
Section | Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston
---|---
Comment ID | 397
Comment | Site 42

Plan indicates that housing demand may exceed supply and that there may be a requirement for a further 8,000 homes before 2036. Before large areas of the locality are built upon, are the Council certain of the requirement? It would seem irresponsible to build numerous 'white elephants'. Is this not merely a function of the Government's policy to build a specified number of homes but without certainty of need in this area?

Plan indicates that there are already 3,141 new homes in the pipeline plus a further 633 anticipated. That would seem to be enough for the present until precise requirements are known.

a) Most employment is South of the river.
b) Transport in Blundeston is poor, there is bad road access and it is dangerous even with low traffic. Sites 164-165 are better served.
c) Site does not benefit from obvious safe and easy access.
d) Why spoil such a beautiful area, enjoyed by tourists, local runners and cyclists? Further traffic would be a hazard.
e) As a Chartered Surveyor, your numbers per hectare do not appear to be accurate.
f) There are no amenities in Blundeston, not even a village shop for milk, bread etc.
g) There is no regular bus service. Increased traffic to get in and out of the village is an environmental issue. Areas identified South of Lowestoft are already served by public transport and allocated safe cycle routes.
h) Properties in Blundeston are mature. New homes next to what are already new homes in Carlton Colville would be much better.
i) By publishing this document, you seem to have added planning blight to nearly all of the homes surrounding Lowestoft for no apparent reason.
j) Building 456 new homes in Blundeston would almost double the population of the village, surely not desirable, sensible or necessary.
k) Current essential services / supply (water / sewerage / gas, etc.) are limited. At certain times of the day water pressure is already very low.
l) Risk of flooding through rainfall if a concrete jungle is built - sewers can't cope.
m) Broadband is slow and mobile phone signal is bad.
n) Development on the prison site is already ample for the village to cope.
with.

o) Blundeston is inhabited by lots of wildlife - there are owls, newts, hedgehogs, etc. I've heard baby owls calling to their parents from our house. Some of these species are becoming rare. Why destroy these areas when there are alternatives?

It makes far more sense to build on the sites identified in Carlton Colville. The proper infrastructure could be put in place in one designated area. Why spoil beautiful landscapes, upset huge numbers of the local population and potentially decrease tourism and enjoyment of the areas outlined.
David Bennett

Section  Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID  680

Comment  I am writing to you to express my concern and to object to the proposed development of site 42 adjacent to Market Lane in the village of Blundeston. My property overlooks site 42 and currently has attractive views to both front and rear and is the reason we purchased this property. I do not wish for this rural setting to be made into an estate. This development will inevitably reduce house prices for the residents of Market Lane and make this a less desirable part of the village.
David Grant

Section Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 187

Comment I strongly oppose the proposed development of 127 dwellings off Market Lane, Blundeston. I have serious concerns regarding traffic influx and road infrastructure allowing the safe transport flow through the village. The current drainage and services would not cope with the addition of 127 dwellings. The current storm water out flow for Market Lane would not cope with additional housing. Anglian Water have been on site within the last few months and are well aware of this problem. The village primary school will also be unable to cope with an additional influx of children to the area.

The area is of ecological importance with a public footpath running through the proposed site with known sightings of badgers, foxes, barn owls, buzzards and bats.

I would urge you to reconsider your proposal for these dwellings and to also take into account the well being of the many elderly residents who reside within Market Lane.
Donna Warren

Section          Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID        768

Comment
To whom it may concern! It has been brought to my attention that there is intent to build opposite my house 127! Houses! I have lived in the village for 48 years! 21 at current address! When I moved out of my family home to start my own family! My husband and I worked all hours we could with a young family to make it possible to afford a lovely village life with a lovely home with a school and play school offering the best! If we wanted to live in a build up area we would have got a cheaper property in park hill area! Why do you think more houses is needed? out drains down our road flood into the local pond on an occasion killing fish and polluting the pond! We don’t want built up areas! Which will then need doctor surgery /shops /garage! We lived with out for years and don’t want them now !!! Keep this village what it should be a village! It can’t cope with any more big building plots! The old prison will be supplying many new buildings which people find is enough! A Property down market lane (lovely bungalow! Pulled down ) is being developed into a house that’s not even in keeping with the village! No body wants a housing estate in a village !!! Properties close will lose value! Which many have worked so hard to have! and to keep !hold A village meeting and you would see how many feel about your plans
Elizabeth Fulwood

Section  Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID  676

Comment  Following receipt of a copy of the proposed new housing sites in Blundeston, I write to express my concerns over 2 sites in particular, Site 63, suggested for 242 houses and Site 42 suggested for 127 houses. Whilst smaller developments of 5 or 10 houses can almost be built unnoticed, much larger developments such as those suggested for Sites 63 and 42 would, I feel, destroy the beauty, the peacefulness and charm of the village which are the very reasons I moved into Blundeston over 25 years ago. The open spaces and views I have enjoyed in the village for many years would be lost and traffic and noise would increase. Whilst I understand that not all sites will be needed and not all the proposed number of houses on those sites will be built, I am concerned that should the larger sites go ahead, the Blundeston I know and love today will be lost.
I do not object to new houses being built in Blundeston but I do object to such large developments.
Gary Shilling

Section
Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID
379

Comment
As outlined in my local village newsletter (Blundeston) I would like to register my rejection to any large scale building (sites 29, 42, 63 & 129), in my opinion the village neither has or has the ability to enable a construction on these scales. We have neither the roads to handle the increased traffic (roads not in a good state of repair or wide enough, concerns for children around the village as no road has a cycle lane or footpath), the school could not accommodate an increase, no local facilities and simply no need. It is nice to remain a village and not end up becoming part of oil ton broad as outlined village has done! I have no objection to small (under 10) development that allow the village to absorb the impact that it would have. I understand this is a biased view, but like everybody whom lives here, we picked it because it is a small village. This is mind with the development on the old prison site and other sites (that have been constructed and are just footings in the ground) the usual infill sites have been enough. The development on the prison will increase the traffic in and out of the village hugely as most households have two cars if not more, and that with children staying at home for longer traffic will increase without further building. It can already be seen throughout Lowestoft, Blundeston aside people are increasing parking on the road instead of using garages of changing front gardens to off road parking which should be implemented to remove cars parked on roads to increase road safety. Sorry didn't mean to turn into a rant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gary Shilling</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gary Shilling

Section | Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID | 580

Comment | Not suitable as village infrastructure not capable of sustain a development of this size, i.e drainage (already an unsolved problem), roads (too narrow and un paved for pedestrians),
Gerry Kitchener

Section  Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID  633

Comment  In the ten years we’ve lived in Blundeston it has continued to grow with building that has respected the character of the village. From our own experience the Planning Dept can take some of the credit for this. How then is a development that looks to shoehorn 130 units into a green space close to the village centre even up for discussion/comment?

I have seen the term "bombing" used to describe how developers look to drop these sort of developments into the countryside and the term is an appropriate one in this case as it would have a devasting impact on the village and destroy the character of the village.

We have one of the many homes that enjoys looking on to this piece of countyside and do not want to lose it to greedy developers. We certainly dont want to be living on the perimeter of a housing estate. The Planning Dept should not entertain this proposal and should protect the green spaces around Blundeston.
**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to the Plough - Grade II Listed building. Potential impact upon the setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ian Burwood

Section Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 242

Comment

To whom it may concern,

As a resident on Market Lane for the last 17 years, we have had a long and painful situation with regards to surface water and sewage issues along the length of Market Lane outside our property. Although some works have been carried out, it is still debatable as to whether the issue have been completely solved. Apart from the obvious of this potential planning causing the glorious field views behind us being taken from us and other residents along this stretch, the infrastructure for surface water and sewage systems would be of a very serious concern, with doubts already about the current system.

We have over the last couple of years attempted to sell our house, but with the water and sewage issues encountered it has caused doubt in potential buyers, and thus has had a knock on effect concerning the value, and ultimately the selling price of our property.

The initial attraction for us to purchase our house was the rural, peace and quiet location of a village atmosphere, this unfortunately has decreased over the years. If any potential development of this kind is considered, the village feel will no doubt disappear and just become one of the many concrete jungles that are appearing more and more within the UK countryside.

Kind Regards...Ian Burwood
John and Ann Reeve

Section Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 910

Comment We wish to register our objection to the development of Site 42. The prison site is to be developed, this is a brownfield site & obviously something will be built there. This will stretch the amenities of this village to the maximum. At present the village resembles a building site with all the minor developments spread around. The prison development will dramatically increase the population of the village, and further loss of greenfield areas will result in it becoming an urban sprawl. There is insufficient infrastructure to support these wholesale building plans - a point which has already been acknowledged. We have made our position clear to our Councillor, and hope for an outcome which will prevent the loss of unspoilt land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Mitchell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Doylend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | With comment to the option of sites that housing has been proposed for in our village, I seriously think that our small village roads cannot cope with the extra volume of traffic. Sites 42, 27, 129, 29 should definitely be ruled out.

Site 42 – Market Lane certainly cannot cope with a potential extra 254 cars (2 per household). |
Melanie Wright

Section  Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID  27

Comment  I have always understood that the only future development that would be allowed in Blundeston would be "infill", ie on land between existing dwellings, or to replace an existing property. This site does not appear to fall within those criteria, and would vastly increase the size of the village, over and above any redevelopment on the old prison site, and we simply do not have the infrastructure to cope with additional dwellings in the number proposed.

If I am correct in thinking that the land is that which runs behind the Plough, then this has been prone to retaining a lot of surface water and may not be suitable to be developed. There is also the issue of access from Market Lane, not to mention the further erosion of available farmland in the area.

We have only just, after over 20 years of trying, got the issue of flooding on Market Lane sorted out and a development of this size could impact on the work that has been done in this respect and allow the flooding issue to become active again. This would be a shame given the efforts made by residents, the Parish and Local councils, and our MP, which resulted in the issue being resolved.

It is all very well building more and more houses, but where are these people going to find employment, where will their children go to school, and where will they be able to register with doctors and dentists to look after their health needs? The doctors surgery at Bridge Road is already suffering due to the influx of patients from the recently closed surgery in Oulton village, the village school is nearing capacity with little scope to expand its building, and there are very limited employment opportunities in the local area.

I think that major planning applications MUST take these considerations into account - there is the need to look not only at the quantity of properties being built but also the quality of life for those who move into them. Sadly, this does not always appear to be taken into account, and is leading to Lowestoft and the surrounding area being in danger of becoming one overgrown housing estate with little to offer residents in the way of jobs, amenities or a satisfying lifestyle.
Mr David and Mrs Mavis Wilson

Section Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 873

Comment We have enjoyed living in Market Lane, Blundeston for 27 years with the same neighbours, with open countryside front and rear. We are now in our late seventies and eighties and thought that we would be enjoying seeing these views until the end, not 127 houses as proposed. Blundeston, in our opinion, has been and will be, overdeveloped with houses. No new facilities, the school will be too small, inadequate drainage, sewage, etc. There will be more cars, some of the streets already have problems with vehicles not being able to pass through, and the bus service has been cut which is a problem with young and elderly residents.

We are not just speaking in regard of the field at the rear of our property, but all the other sites which are being proposed. With the prison land already going to have 130 houses built upon it, the village will look like a town, not a village.

Please would you reconsider many of these sites?
Tim caley

Section Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 301

Comment This is green belt land. Blundeston has a huge pending development site at the prison site. There is no infrastructure in the village to support the present expansion let alone more building. Blundeston has no shops, doctors surgery or dentist and has a school which is already oversubscribed. All local roads are small and dangerous with numerous blind bends and hidden entrances and exits. Further increases in traffic will increase deaths and or serious injuries. Roads are in an appalling state of repair and are constantly clogged with school traffic.
Newman

Section: Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID: 334

Comment: I cannot see how the infrastructure into Blundeston can support this density of housing in the heart of the village. A best guess would be an additional 200 cars and Market Lane is just not suitable for that volume of traffic. The other obvious concern is supply of utilities and waste removal from such a large site.

Secondly, I agree with the strategy to use small and discreet parcels of land for development but such a large development in the heart of the Blundeston village would have a massively negative impact on the character of this village.

My last point is why has the development of the former prison site been taken into consideration for the WDC development plan. Surely this should be taken into consideration!
**Stuart Precious**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

**Comment ID**  
376

**Comment**  
As per my other comment: As a resident of this village I am very concerned that a development of this size which is frankly un-necessary, would irreparably alter the character and dynamics of the village. The infrastructure required does not exist. We don't even have an effective bus service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not a business David Preston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school Maria Ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
simon bunting

Section  Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID  337

Comment  too many houses in village for school /roads /parking
no healthcare to support this population increase
Comment ID 195

Comment

I write in connection to the above, potential proposed land for development at Market Lane in Blundeston. I have examined the plan in detail and know the site well. I am perplexed and dismayed that this land could even be considered for development given the impact that this would cause to the village, the environment, the nature and its wildlife. The poor drainage/ seweage network that already exists in the Market Lane area causes flooding and sometimes raw sewage to enter into private dwellings gardens when the drains cannot cope, this problem would only be heightened with higher volumes of sewage and rainwater run off from further housing. The road network is also made up of narrow country lanes and are no way intended or designed to cope with large volumes of traffic from a new residential estate. This has been proved countless times when the A12 has been closed off due to an accident and the traffic has had to be re-directed through the village causing bottlenecks, long delays and safety issues. 

Children who live in the village including our own are encouraged to walk or bike to school at the moment whenever possible (Blundeston primary) to help relieve the traffic congestion that already exists at the school area during pick up/drop off times and also to encourage exercise. This will then not be possible for my children and many others as the dangers created by the high volumes of traffic travelling at high speed on the narrow country roads roads means it will be unsafe for them to walk or bike to school. There are no paths, cycle lanes or street lights so the children have to use the roads to get to and from school. If it becomes a safety issue then children cannot and will not be allowed to walk or bike to school, this will then have the knock on effect of creating more traffic at the school as more parents will have to use the car.

I wish to object strongly to this land being developed for extra houses in this location. Estate development would overwhelm it and ruin the character of this beautiful village and the visual impact it would have on it. The proposed development would potentially kill off the rare species of wildlife that live on the above rural land (adders - reported and documented with RAUK adder conservation, barn owls and field mice), and would also destroy ancient field boundaries. The proposed large development at Market Lane plus others in the village including the one at
the prison site would in all honestly mean the end of this famous small village and due to the increase in size would become a town. This would have the adverse affect of driving many generations of local born and breed families away from the area taking there business with them. Our property would become engulfed, overlooked from the side and rear of the property. This would have an adverse impact on our view, it would block sunlight into the garden throughout the entire day and kill off the wildlife that enters into our garden. This would also affect the view of the majority of local residents within the area/village. The noise, disturbance, loss of privacy, overshadowing are all things that should be looked into. This proposed development is over bearing, out of scale for a small village, have a huge impact on the environment, the nature, the wildlife that lives and thrives there and will have a huge safety impact on the area. Finally, the proposed piece of land at Market Lane is one of tranquility, stunning scenery, of nature, of significant history, a haven for wildlife which should and must not be destroyed just to squeeze in extra affordable housing. As once the countryside is gone we can never get it back again.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The large sites around Blundeston (63, 42, 129) are not currently desirable as there are limited amenities and services within reasonable distance to promote sustainable travel patterns and some of the road network might not be of sufficient standard or capacity. If this scale of development, including growth beyond the village and the proposed redevelopment of the prison, is to be brought forward, a comprehensive review of transport issues will need to be undertaken which may include opportunities for further enhancement of transport infrastructure and services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Terry Gooding**

**Section**
Potential land for development 42 - Land at Market Lane, Blundeston

**Comment ID**
345

**Comment**
Blundeston cannot support a development of this size, there simply isn’t the infrastructure to justify it. Destruction of greenfield sites, over subscription of essential services such as schools and doctors, the fact that roads will become busier and more dangerous as a result. Increased risks of flooding due to concrete coverage.

As a wider concern I do not see plans for new hospitals, fire stations, police stations, doctors, school or public transport

Why is the redevelopment of the prison site not included here which in itself will contain at least 100 houses - will this offset your need to build all over Blundeston & ruin yet another beautiful village. People live here to escape the sprawl not live on a housing estate.

I appreciate that housing is required but not on this scale and any planning application of this nature will be opposed by all who live there.
Potential land for development 43 - Land at Montrose Garage, London Road, Beccles

**Section**
Potential land for development 43 - Land at Montrose Garage, London Road, Beccles

**Comment ID**
640

**Comment**
this looks like a sensible site with good links via the london road - it is also a brown field site. housing density seems high
### Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 43 - Land at Montrose Garage, London Road, Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We have already placed before you the virtues of each of the sites which we have submitted and make the point that, in the event of allocation, we are in a position to bring each forward for development within the early years of the plan. Each is well located in relation to existing built development and can proceed without reliance on others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beccles Town Council C Boyne

Section
Potential land for development 43 - Land at Montrose Garage, London Road, Beccles

Comment ID 783

Comment
Whilst the council appreciate the need for development in the area over the next twenty years, it must be handled with great care as the infrastructure in Beccles is at breaking point now, especially the Health Centre. With this in mind, it is felt that any housing development should be restricted to the area to the South West on one or two of the sites numbered 24, 43, 108, 145 and 156, as this makes the best use of the existing and planned road infrastructure. However, this area would require a new primary school and a convenience store and other associated infrastructure to service any expansion. In addition, the two small sites in Beccles, numbers 1 and 16 and site number 60 in Worlingham could also be included as sites for development.
| Section | Potential land for development 43 - Land at Montrose Garage, London Road, Beccles |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
| Comment ID | 853 |
| Comment | Group of sites to the south of Beccles – As they are on rising ground, any development proposals would need to be assessed for potential landscape and visual impacts on the Broads area. |
Councillor Caroline Topping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 43 - Land at Montrose Garage, London Road, Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>As I said earlier, I am not against Beccles having new affordable homes and bungalows however these need to be built in manageable sizes around the periphery of the town and brown field sites such as plot 16 (24 homes) in the town centre and plots 156 (260 homes), 43 (40 homes), 108 (49 homes) all along a current main road, where there is currently little development and not feeding into the current traffic hot spots which is Ingate Street/Lowestoft Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  
Potential land for development 43 - Land at Montrose Garage, London Road, Beccles

Comment ID  
1016

Comment  
Proximity to Beccles Conservation Area - potential impact upon Conservation Area.
Paul Leman

Section: Potential land for development 43 - Land at Montrose Garage, London Road, Beccles

Comment ID: 425

Comment: This Site is not suitable for development. It will significantly add to road congestion in the area / Beccles as a whole. The Beccles Medical Centre is already overstretched. Any housing development should be well outside existing towns / on a new settlement.
Potential land for development 44 - Land at Sandpit Lane, Worlingham

andy house

Section  | Potential land for development 44 - Land at Sandpit Lane, Worlingham

Comment ID | 229

Comment | I do not think this site is suitable for a development of this scale as the road access is on minor roads through residential estates. The school already crowds the roads at certain times. There are few local facilities in Worlingham and direct access to those in Beccles is along Lowestoft Road which has several traffic pinch points already - rail crossing, peddars traffic lights and Blyburgate.
If college lane is seen as the main access to Beccles the right turn onto Ellough Road would require upgrading
Any significant increase in population of Worlingham would further stress the healthcare facilities at Beccles Medical Centre and the local dentists which are already difficult to access.
andy house

Section  Potential land for development 44 - Land at Sandpit Lane, Worlingham

Comment ID  637

Comment  90 houses seem a lot for this small area and would be out of character with the surrounding parts of Worlingham. Perhaps half this number would be more appropriate. It would best be accessed from College Lane which would need an improved junction with Ellough Road.
Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Potential land for development 44 - Land at Sandpit Lane, Worlingham

Comment ID 1122

Comment We have already placed before you the virtues of each of the sites which we have submitted and make the point that, in the event of allocation, we are in a position to bring each forward for development within the early years of the plan. Each is well located in relation to existing built development and can proceed without reliance on others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul Gurbutt</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 44 - Land at Sandpit Lane, Worlingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**     | 1. How do you protect the historic heart of Beccles from the increased traffic. All the developments are south of Worlingham and all the supermarkets are to the north (*) traffic blocking Beccles. The secondary schools locations (*) that cross Beccles traffic is inevitable. Larkfleet (area 82) gave no assurance of any solution to the traffic problem.  
2. How do you plan for extra infrastructure? I have heard from Anglian Water that the sewage treatment works is already over stretched, without 100's more houses. |
Rachael Staniul

Section: Potential land for development 44 - Land at Sandpit Lane, Worlingham

Comment ID: 880

Comment: Is a prime example of a rich wildlife habitat – birds, insects, butterflies and mammals. Hedgehogs are in serious decline due to habitat loss, and the removal of hedgerows. Covering this in concrete would be devastating for the wildlife, and would have a knock on effect for the whole area. Surely brownfield sites must be prioritised, rather than simply concreting over the countryside. We owe it to future generations to preserve such beautiful and diverse habitats, - not lose them forever.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 44 - Land at Sandpit Lane, Worlingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Sites 8; 9; 44; 60; 62; 81; 82 and 89 form a large block of land which is likely to be of some value, particularly for farmland species. Careful consideration should therefore be given to the allocation of these sites for residential development, in order to ensure that it does not result in an adverse impact on the wildlife value of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Doherty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 44 - Land at Sandpit Lane, Worlingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Sites 44/60/62 Over 600 houses in this area is not sustainable, again no infrastructure, loss of habitat for wildlife, far too many houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 44 - Land at Sandpit Lane, Worlingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | As a resident of Worlingham my concerns are for the areas listed (82, 62, 60, 44).
Increase in traffic
Will local drainage be able to cope. A recent response to our Neighbourhood Plan group indicates that foul and surface water drainage is already virtually at its limit.
What will WDC do to improve facilities in Worlingham as we currently have no village hall, pub etc.
What will determine the number / rate of housebuilding in Worlingham?
Can you please differentiate between Worlingham and Beccles, they are not the same place!
Will the local plan consider a new doctors surgery in Worlingham.
What is WDC position with the Larkfleet housing proposal. When will you have establish what growth level you will be working with?
How will our neighbourhood plan be able to influence WDC planning?
When do we need to have our neighbourhood plan in place to be considered in WDC planning? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Worlingham Parish Council Lesley Beevor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 45 - Land at St Johns Road, Bungay

Anonymous

Section Potential land for development 45 - Land at St Johns Road, Bungay

Comment ID 215

Comment Places labelled 55, 37 on the Bungay development map are areas not very well set up with infrastructure, they include already very built up urban areas. With this the land on St Johns Hill (45) would better be suited for housing and other leisure facilities.
Diane Scott

Section
Potential land for development 45 - Land at St Johns Road, Bungay

Comment ID
404

Comment
There is already outline planning permission for development of housing adjacent to the swimming pool on the other side of St. Johns Road. Further development of Site 45 would cause more traffic congestion with most traffic either going south to north through the centre or turning East towards Lowestoft through residential areas and school. It is not suitable to use before a bi-pass is built. It was not included in the current plan as it is prone to flooding and expensive to develop and this has not changed. It would also lose valuable agricultural land.

Additional development on this scale would put too much pressure on public services such as health, schools and sewerage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>In past reports this area has been identified as an area at risk of flooding and that it would be inappropriate for housing to be built on it. In my opinion it should be regarded as &quot;greenbelt&quot; and should not be developed at all. The charm of living in Bungay is that there are wide open spaces just outside the town and this is gradually being eroded by ribbon development along major routes into the town. Development, with tall houses, cheek by jowl, linked by narrow roads filled with parked cars has already taken place on the opposite side of the road to this land and it does nothing to enhance the town. Therefore further development should not take place. Building on the &quot;green&quot; site would also reduce property prices in Fairfield, Kerrison and Mayfair Road as many properties back on this land which gives them highly sought after country view, whilst still living in the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Davison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 45 - Land at St Johns Road, Bungay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>OBJECTION TO FIELD NUMBER 45 BEING CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is greenbelt arable farmland at the rear of Kerrison and Fairfield Roads, which is fully utilized with crops, and is not laying fallow. There is a flood plain, also, a listed farmhouse on this land. The ‘Tin River’ in Hillside Road East, by Mayfair Road and the Wherry Veterinary Group Practice, quite often floods over the A1062, as the water runs off of the Flood Plains to the lower level.

Articulated Lorries travelling on the A143, use the A1062 Hillside Road West, connecting them to A144 Bungay/Halesworth, and, A1062 Beccles via Hillside Road East; all converge at the staggered junction of St John's Hill. The A1062 is single lane traffic from Hillside Road West, to the A143. Not only is the road narrow in places, but, there are sharp bends. Heavy rain leaves the road awash. It would need to be vastly improved to take any extra traffic from more new housing. In addition to the Articulated Lorries, It already has regular use by Lorries from the Gravel Pits.

The Bungay Leisure Centre on the A144 which is opposite this field, Number 45, is widely used from early morning to late evening and the car park is well used. However, cars entering the facility can hold up traffic. This doesn't appear to be an issue at the moment, but, with the increase in proposed housing, this might be problematic.

There is little or no employment available locally, so, new residents in the proposed 2% 150/190 homes, or the 4% 300/380 homes would need to travel to Beccles or Halesworth Railway Stations to commute to work. Consequently, the roads would have to take the increase in cars. There would also need to be more car parking spaces, in or around the Railway Stations. Also, we are talking of 150 to 380 households and not people By building on farmland, it's likely that Bungay will be in danger of losing its own identity and be swallowed-up by expanding towards the surrounding towns. Particularly, as Bungay doesn't have a Railway Station; which are benefits enjoyed by both Beccles and Halesworth.

Relatively recently, the land in question had been ruled-out, in favour of the land behind the Bungay Leisure Centre. It is very worrying to think that even more time is being expended raking over the same issue. We understood that our previous objection was upheld and that 'the powers that be' were satisfied that this same field, No. 45, was not suitable.
Maureen Davison

Section Potential land for development 45 - Land at St Johns Road, Bungay

Comment ID 866

Comment

This is greenbelt arable farmland at the rear of Kerrison and Fairfield Roads, which is fully utilized with crops, and is not laying fallow. There is a flood plain, also, a listed farmhouse on this land.

The 'Tin River' in Hillside Road East, by Mayfair Road and the Wherry Veterinary Group Practice, quite often floods over the A1062, as the water runs off of the Flood Plains to the lower level.

Articulated Lorries travelling on the A143, use the A1062 Hillside Road West, connecting them to A144 Bungay/Halesworth, and, A1062 Beccles via Hillside Road East; all converge at the staggered junction of St John’s Hill.

The A1062 is single lane traffic from Hillside Road West, to the A143. Not only is the road narrow in places, but, there are sharp bends. Heavy rain leaves the road awash. It would need to be vastly improved to take any extra traffic from more new housing. In addition to the Articulated Lorries, it already has regular use by Lorries from the Gravel Pits.

The Bungay Leisure Centre on the A144 which is opposite this field, Number 45, is widely used from early morning to late evening and the car park is well used. However, cars entering the facility can hold up traffic. This doesn't appear to be an issue at the moment, but, with the increase in proposed housing, this might be problematic.

There is little or no employment available locally, so, new residents in the proposed 2% 150/190 homes, or the 4% 300/380 homes would need to travel to Beccles or Halesworth Railway Stations to commute to work.

Consequently, the roads would have to take the increase in cars. There would also need to be more car parking spaces, in or around the Railway Stations. Also, we are talking of 150 to 380 households and not people

By building on farmland, it's likely that Bungay will be in danger of losing its own identity and be swallowed-up, by expanding towards the surrounding towns; particularly, as Bungay doesn't have a Railway Station; which are benefits enjoyed by both Beccles and Halesworth.

Relatively recently, the land in question had been ruled-out, in favour of the land behind the Bungay Leisure Centre. It is very worrying to think that even more time is being expended raking over the same issue. We understood that our previous objection was upheld and that 'the powers that be' were satisfied that this same field, No. 45, was not suitable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mr and Mrs J V Palin</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Richard Emrich and Fiona Emrich

Section: Potential land for development 45 - Land at St Johns Road, Bungay

Comment ID: 975

Comment:
Emailing to raise concerns over proposed new housing development opposite Bungay swimming pool.
1. Not sure that Bungay has the resources for an increased population.
2. Hedgehogs nest, breed and hibernate in our garden. They forage in the field. Hedgehogs are partially protected by the Wildlife & Countryside Act.
3. Skylarks are regularly seen and heard over field, indicating that they nest there. The skylark is on the RSPB red list.
4. Field has flooded in the past.
5. People have been walking along the edge of the field for over 20 years. Under section 31 of the Highways Act 1980 this should lead to it being designated as a public right of way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>St John’s Hall Farms  Anonymous</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 45 - Land at St Johns Road, Bungay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>St John’s Hall Farms can confirming that Site 45 (East of St John’s Road, Bungay) is available for development, suitable and deliverable. If required, the landowner will discuss the potential for additional land to the south east of the site (up towards Dukes Farm) to be included as a comprehensive proposal for the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section: Potential land for development 45 - Land at St Johns Road, Bungay

Comment ID: 867

Comment: Concerns about building new houses in BUNGAY – opposite the swimming pool towards Mettingham
1. Highly productive agriculture land would be destroyed.
2. The job situation in Bungay is not very positive.
Newcomers would have to commute which causes additional congestion and air pollution.
3. The school facilities have not changed and would strain under more pupils.
4. The size of the Bungay surgery has not changed since it was built.
5. Wildlife Habitat:
a) Hedgehogs are wandering from the field into gardens and back.
b) Many songbirds and other birds are established.
c) Skylarks can be seen hovering over the open field.
Their nests in the field would be destroyed.
6. Floods have occurred in the past.
Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section  Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby

Comment ID  1123

Comment  We have already placed before you the virtues of each of the sites which we have submitted and make the point that, in the event of allocation, we are in a position to bring each forward for development within the early years of the plan.
Each is well located in relation to existing built development and can proceed without reliance on others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Between Swan Lane and Beccles Road (the Badger site). This has been the subject of applications on about one quarter of this site – even this was considered excessive and rejected, so the whole site would be far too large – currently farm land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Beccles and Bungay Cycle Strategy Ian Reid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Unsuitable site for development. It is a greenfield site currently in use for agriculture. Single track access road is in regular use by pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists, any increase in traffic would significantly increase the danger to these road users, it is also close to the notorious Barnby bends. The site is close to many natural wildlife habitats including an SSSI and housing development would cause irreparable environmental damage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section: Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby

Comment ID: 858

Comment: Group of sites around Barnby/North Cove – In addition to potential impacts on landscape character (LCAS) and visual amenity for users of the Broads, further development of housing has the potential to increase the recreational pressures on the Broads.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charles Fortt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charlotte Sanderson

Section  Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby

Comment ID  591

Comment  I feel that this development would be inappropriate for a number of reasons:

* This is currently a Greenfield site.
* It has been in constant use as agricultural land, and has only been used as a storage area by the garden centre over the past 10 years.
* It is outside the village envelope.
* The development would change the rural nature of the village and would lead to the suburbanisation of the area.
* I feel that this development would set an unacceptable precedent.
* We already experience low water pressure. 80 further properties would exacerbate this and would place pressure on existing sewage infrastructure.
* The field has been identified as having soil that freely drains. However, the lane is prone to flooding. With the increased run-off from these houses, patios, drives and roadways, this problem could be worsened.
* Barnby has no village shop, few places of employment, and no surgery. The school is full.
* The occupants of the new development would be reliant on their car, which is not sustainable. It is my view that this development is likely to add a further 160 cars regularly using Swan Lane (and a likely 400 extra vehicle movements a day).
* Swan Lane is not wide enough to take the additional traffic and there would be greater likelihood of collisions, particularly close to the junction with Mill Lane and the Garden Centre.
* A wider impact would be the impact on the A146 which is already under huge strain due to increasing commuter traffic.
* Swan Lane is currently used by both North Cove and Barnby residents as a "breathing-space". It is a quiet lane which forms part of a loop around the villages. People of all ages use it for running, walking, cycling, scooting and horse riding. It is particularly important for children and older people who need somewhere safe to exercise.
* Swan Lane is regularly used by horse riders, from the nearby Broads Equestrian Centre, who have developed an access route along the verge of the A146 to allow clients to enjoy this currently safe quiet lane.
* Swan Lane is currently used by over 15 children of all ages to get to and
from the village and their school /school bus. With increased traffic movements and no footpath (not currently needed due to the rural nature of the lane) their safety would be further jeopardised and their independence may be curbed.

* The "soundscape" of this part of the village is likely to change in character. Other than the noise of the A146, it is quite quiet. You can hear farm animals and wildlife. This is an important feature of the villages "breathing space". It is likely that a suburban housing development would add lawnmowers, radios and voices.

* The rural character of the night sky would change, with the addition of security lights and street lights.

* Any green space is of ecological value. Agricultural areas such as this field, its edges and hedges support a thriving population of wild flowers, insects, bats and birds (including skylarks). We regularly see barn owls hunting and have occasionally seen a marsh harrier and buzzards. Deer regularly pass through.

I feel that if this development is allowed, it will be the thin end of the wedge, and there will be a characterless ribbon development between Lowestoft and Beccles along the already overloaded A146.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Historic England Debbie Mack</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julie Reid

Section Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby

Comment ID 487

Comment This site is unsuitable for development for several reasons:
It is a greenfield site, outside the village boundary.
The land is currently in use for agriculture.
The access road is single track and in regular use by Pedestrians, Horse riders and Cyclists. An increase in traffic related to building development would significantly increase the danger to these road users.
The site is close to many natural habitats, including an SSSI. Development of this site would cause irreparable damage with loss of habitat.
This eastern aspect of the village is sparsely populated, and characterful. Any development at this site, would alter this irrevocably, and to it’s detriment.
The village has little infrastructure and amenities, and as such is unsuitable for developmental growth of this scope.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul turner

Section Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby

Comment ID 506

Comment I object to the proposal of houses being built at this site. The site is extremely close to the Barnby nature reserve and Area of Special Scientific Interest. Having roads, houses and pavements on this site will cause excess water to run off into this area and upset the delicate balance. The lanes along this area are too narrow to allow two lanes of traffic to pass each other and are not designed for heavy traffic use. Houses along Swan Lane, The Green and The Sidings are not on the mains for sewage and are not connected to gas mains. The junction leaving Barnby on the A146 is already very busy in the mornings, with additional traffic, this will cause huge delays for residents leaving the village for work in the mornings. The village Primary School cannot accommodate the potential increase in numbers.
Paul turner

Section  Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby

Comment ID  587

Comment  Below are the reasons I object to the development proposed at Swan Lane, Barnby: The area where the development is being proposed is uphill from an area of Special Site of Scientific Interest. Rain water will run off of the development directly to this area. This excess water, that cannot absorb into the land due to the development would certainly upset the delicate balance of this rich and unique ecosystem.

The road infrastructure in this part of Barnby would simply not support the additional load the proposed development would bring with it. The lanes are pitifully narrow and they would in no way cope safely with the increased traffic. On a good day, it still takes me a while to safely exit from the junction from the village onto the a146, with the increase in flow, it will turn the junction into a real issue. There is also no mains sewage to support the proposed housing site and the local primary school is at its full capacity.
Robert Gill

Section Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby

Comment ID 237

Comment we oppose the inclusion of this site - for the same reasons as stated for site 57. Also, this site has recently been the subject of an appeal by the developer which was rejected at appeal stage. The site should remain outside the physical limits.
Tracy Morgan

Section  Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby

Comment ID  505

Comment

I object to the proposal of houses being built at this site. The site is extremely close to the Barnby nature reserve and Area of Special Scientific Interest. Roads, houses and pavements on this site will cause excess water to run off into this area and upset the delicate balance. The lanes along this area are too narrow to allow two lanes of traffic to pass each other and are not designed for heavy traffic use. Houses along Swan Lane, The Green and The Sidings are not on the mains for sewage and are not connected to gas mains. The junction leaving Barnby on the A146 is already very busy in the mornings, with additional traffic, this will cause huge delays for residents leaving the village for work in the mornings. The village Primary School cannot accommodate the potential increase in numbers.
**Tracy Morgan**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 46 - Land at Swan Lane, Barnby

**Comment ID**  
544

**Comment**  
Below are the reasons I object to the development proposed at Swan Lane, Barnby.

The area where the development is being proposed is uphill from an area of Special Site of Scientific Interest. Rain water will run off of the development directly to this area. This excess water, that cannot absorb into the land due to the development, would certainly upset the delicate balance of this rich and unique ecosystem.

The road infrastructure in this part of Barnby would simply not support the additional load the proposed development would bring with it. The lanes are pitifully narrow and they would in no way cope safely with the increased traffic. On a good day, it still takes me a while to safely exit from the junction from the village onto the a146, with the increase in flow, it will turn the junction into a real issue. There is also no mains sewage to support the proposed housing site and the local primary school is at its full capacity.
Potential land for development 47 - Land at the Former Garage, Somerleyton

Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council S H Read

Section  Potential land for development 47 - Land at the Former Garage, Somerleyton

Comment ID  693

Comment  (The proposed site also includes the paddock behind the Post Office Stores). Some parts of this site are held by lease by third parties, the access shown is unsuitable, a large part of the garage site and oil storage yard is likely to be contaminated. However, the site is not completely rejected and it might be considered for a smaller number of houses than the indicative number and if the problems can be overcome.
David Cook

Section  Potential land for development 47 - Land at the Former Garage, Somerleyton

Comment ID  567

Comment  We would like to object to the development of the above site for the following reasons:
The development is within the Conservation area and should not be considered.
There is already a considerable amount of traffic on Somerleyton Street (yes a street not a road). We have lived in the village since 2001 and have noticed a steady increase in the number of cars using the Street and parking on the Street. New houses within the village would add to the amount of traffic and increase the number of traffic incidents.
There is already a Planning Application in place to allow the Petrol Station to be converted into a shop with parking at the rear of the premises. Access to any future development of this site would be through the former garage site thus increasing the amount of traffic entering or leaving the Street on a very dangerous corner, that at present, has no parking restrictions in place. Access to this site would be extremely close to existing properties and through traffic would be easily heard by the tenants of these properties. As the proposed development of up to 16 properties is behind existing properties that front the Street, the new properties would overlook them and effectively, double up the properties on the Street. In our opinion this would start to erode the quaintness and traditional look of the village.
The site has been used as an oil distribution yard for at least the last 50 years. We have been informed that over the years, there has been several major spillages of oil from the tanks on the site. It is highly likely this would be revealed in any soil samples analysed and cleaning up the site would be an extremely costly and time consuming project.
David Cook and Jenny Anderson
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Potential land for development 47 - Land at the Former Garage, Somerleyton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Located within the Conservation Area, close to Somerleyton Park Historic Parks and Gardens and proximity to The Rosery and adjacent to a plethora of buildings and other historic assets around The Green including the village pump, The Old Farmhouse, County Primary School and a number of dwellings, all grade II listed. Potential impact upon Conservation Area, Historic Park and Garden and setting of Listed Buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joy Jones

Section  
Potential land for development 47 - Land at the Former Garage, Somerleyton

Comment ID  
565

Comment  
If there must be new housing in Somerleyton then this is a site which could be developed without impinging on green space in the village. This site is also quite near to the junction to Lowestoft and in easy walking distance of the school. Housing in Somerleyton is not affordable to many young families trying to get on the housing ladder. Perhaps the idea of a small number of affordable houses for families, that are designed in a way that is sympathetic to the historic nature of the village, could be explored.
### Peter Carrier

**Section**  
Potential land for development 47 - Land at the Former Garage, Somerleyton

**Comment ID**  
459

**Comment**  
Holy unsuitable sites for such massive builds, there is inadequate infrastructure (sewage, utilities and roads) such a project would ruin the outlying area, in addition This would take away good agricultural land growing food, a consideration for lowering the imports and potential local economy issues with the EU.
Paul Douch

Section  Potential land for development 47 - Land at the Former Garage, Somerleyton

Comment ID  446

Comment  Potential for a small development of circa 6-8 houses or bungalows, incl starter & affordable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 47 - Land at the Former Garage, Somerleyton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Site Description and Development Potential  
9.1 Site Option 47 is the former garage site and land located to the rear of the Post Office and would be accessed via 'Blacksmith's Loke' beside the garage which is land owned by The Estate. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 7.  
9.2 The site is 0.64ha in size. According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 19 dwellings (including 6 affordable homes) on this part of the site. Mirroring surrounding development density we consider the site is could accommodate 12 to 15 dwellings.  
Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal  
9.3 The site sustainability appraisal (SSA) at Points 1 and 4 refer to "limited village facilities". This is incorrect. The Waveney village profile or Somerleyton confirms that there is a full suite of key facilities and this needs to be recognised. |
Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Comment ID 1124

Comment We have already placed before you the virtues of each of the sites which we have submitted and make the point that, in the event of allocation, we are in a position to bring each forward for development within the early years of the plan. Each is well located in relation to existing built development and can proceed without reliance on others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnby Parish Council Ian Hinton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Beccles and Bungay Cycle Strategy Ian Reid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>This site is unsuitable for housing development - it is adjacent to a SSSI and thus any development would have a detrimental effect on the environment. The site is outside the village boundary and would constitute an out-of-proportion extension to the village. The site is prone to periodic flooding, there is no infrastructure to support a housing development, and access is via a single-track country lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ben Blower

Section: Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Comment ID: 248

Comment: The development of this site would offer an opportunity to improve this part of the village by removing the rather unsightly old agricultural building and would provide enough space to combine some new housing with an open space that could become a proper village green giving this part of the village a focal point.

New housing in the village would support the existing rural businesses (garden centre, pub/restaurant, hairdresser) located there and improve the viability of the village primary school.
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Comment ID 859

Comment Group of sites around Barnby/North Cove – In addition to potential impacts on landscape character (LCAS) and visual amenity for users of the Broads, further development of housing has the potential to increase the recreational pressures on the Broads.
Charlotte Sanderson

Section | Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Comment ID | 593

Comment | I feel that this development would be inappropriate for a number of reasons:
* This is currently a Greenfield site.
* It is outside the village envelope.
* The development of 55 homes would change the very rural nature of this end of the village and would lead to the suburbanisation of the area.
* I feel that this development would set an unacceptable precedent.
* We already experience low water pressure. 55 further properties would exacerbate this and would place pressure on existing sewage infrastructure.
* The field has been identified as having soil that freely drains down to the marsh adjacent. The lane at this point is already prone to flooding. With the increased run-off (likely to be contaminated with phosphates, nitrates and plastics) from these houses, patios, drives and roadways, this problem could be exacerbated and may lead to the flooding of existing homes.
* This area drains into a SSSI and NNR, it is very close to the Broads National Park Boundary.
* This areas of rough grassland, that has not been treated with pesticides or herbicides for some years are increasingly rare. The grassland, edges and hedges provide habitats for a diverse plant and animal community. We regularly see a wider range of birds including barn owls hunting, skylarks, marsh harriers and buzzards, We have seasonal visits from swifts, swallows, hobbies, and a nightingale. Deer regularly pass through.
* Barnby has no village shop, few places of employment, and no surgery. The school is full.
* The occupants of the new development would be reliant on their car, which is not sustainable. It is my view that this development is likely to add a further 110 cars regularly using Swan Lane (and add a likely 330 extra vehicle movements a day).
* Swan Lane is not wide enough to take the additional traffic and there would be greater likelihood of collisions, particularly close to the junction with Mill Lane and the Garden Centre.
* A wider impact would be the impact on the A146 which is already under huge strain due to increasing commuter traffic.
* Swan Lane is currently used by both North Cove and Barnby residents as a "breathing-space". It is a quiet lane which forms part of a loop around the...
villages. People of all ages use it for running, walking, cycling, scooting and horse riding. It is particularly important for children and older people who need somewhere safe to exercise.

* Swan Lane is regularly used by horse riders, from the nearby Broads Equestrian Centre, who have developed an access route along the verge of the A146 to allow clients to enjoy this currently safe quiet lane.

* Swan Lane is currently used by over 15 children of all ages to get to and from the village and their school /school bus. With increased traffic movements and no footpath (not currently needed due to the rural nature of the lane) their safety would be further jeopardised and their independence may be curbed.

* The "soundscape" of this part of the village is likely to change in character. Other than the noise of the A146, it is quite quiet. You can hear farm animals and wildlife. This is an important feature of the villages "breathing space". It is likely that a suburban housing development would add lawnmowers, radios and voices. The rural character of the night sky would change, with the addition of security lights and potentially street lights.

I feel that if this development is allowed, it will be the thin end of the wedge, and there will be a characterless ribbon development between Lowestoft and Beccles along the already overloaded A146.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  
Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Comment ID  
1019

Comment  
Proximity to church of John the Baptist Grade II*. Potential impact upon setting of high grade Listed Building.
Julie Reid

Section: Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Comment ID: 485

Comment: This site is unsuitable for building development for a number of reasons: It is adjacent to a SSSI, including Barnby Broad, and therefore is important corridor for wildlife. The site is periodically farmed including animal grazing. While outside the floodplain, it is well known for poor drainage. It is outside current village boundaries, with no infrastructure - single track country lane access, no mains drainage, gas or street lighting. A development here would create a steep increase in traffic levels on unsuitable quiet lanes with a consequent damaging effect on the environment for both people and wildlife. Development of this site would significantly alter the character of the village, to its detriment.
North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans

Section  
Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Comment ID  574

Comment  
Visually intrusive, access terrible development into the open countryside
Paul turner

Section: Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Comment ID: 507

Comment:
I object to the proposal of houses being built at this site. The site is extremely close to the Barnby nature reserve and Area of Special Scientific Interest. Having roads, houses and pavements on this site will cause excess water to run off into this area and upset the delicate balance. The lanes along this area are too narrow to allow two lanes of traffic to pass each other and are not designed for heavy traffic use. Houses along Swan Lane, The Green and The Sidings are not on the mains for sewage and are not connected to gas mains. The junction leaving Barnby on the A146 is already very busy in the mornings, with additional traffic, this will cause huge delays for residents leaving the village for work in the mornings. The village Primary School cannot accommodate the potential increase in numbers.
Paul turner

Section  Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Comment ID  537

Comment  Below are the reasons I object to the development proposed at The Sidings. The area where the development is being proposed is utterly unique and important, it is a green belt area, an intelligent and environmentally responsible ideal, one in which I deeply believe should be upheld and protected without question. A development of the size proposed would have a massively detrimental effect on both the landscape and wildlife, as well as the mental well being of the local residence, to see the area I love, deeply respect and appreciate changed beyond all recognition, would be personally soul destroying. The proposed development is located within a designated area of special scientific interest and a development would have an untold impact on the delicate balance of this rich and unique ecosystem. The road infrastructure in this part of Barnby would simply not support the additional load the proposed development would bring with it. The lanes are pitifully narrow and they would in no way cope safely with the increased traffic. On a good day, it still takes me a while to safely exit from the junction from the village onto the a146, with the increase in flow, it will turn the junction into a real issue. There is also no mains sewage to support the proposed housing site and the local primary school which is at its full capacity,
Tracy Morgan

Section  Potential land for development 48 - Land at The Green, Barnby

Comment ID  538

Comment  Below are the reasons I object to the development proposed at The Sidings. The area where the development is being proposed is utterly unique and important, it is a green belt area, an intelligent and environmentally responsible ideal, one in which I deeply believe should be upheld and protected without question. A development of the size proposed would have a massively detrimental effect on both the landscape and wildlife, as well as the mental well being of the local residence, to see the area I love, deeply respect and appreciate changed beyond all recognition, would be personally soul destroying. The proposed development is located within a designated area of special scientific interest and a development would have an untold impact on the delicate balance of this rich and unique ecosystem. The road infrastructure in this part of Barnby would simply not support the additional load the proposed development would bring with it. The lanes are pitifully narrow and they would in no way cope safely with the increased traffic. On a good day, it still takes me a while to safely exit from the junction from the village onto the a146, with the increase in flow, it will turn the junction into a real issue. There is also no mains sewage to support the proposed housing site and the local primary school is at its full capacity.
Potential land for development 49 - Land at The Homestead, Lound Road, Blundeston

**andy Howlett**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 49 - Land at The Homestead, Lound Road, Blundeston

**Comment ID**  
292

**Comment**  
Suggest that this is planted as a woodland area to make wildlife habitation. The village of Blundeston will become Carlton Colville if further development is permitted. Just take a drive down The Street in Blundeston along the obstacle course and mish mash of parked cars and current overdevelopment. On the plan so far no account is taken of any future development of the former prison site and the impact this could have. Blundeston is a village – keep it that way. This is simply greed and over development. We strongly object.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 49 - Land at The Homestead, Lound Road, Blundeston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We have already placed before you the virtues of each of the sites which we have submitted and make the point that, in the event of allocation, we are in a position to bring each forward for development within the early years of the plan. Each is well located in relation to existing built development and can proceed without reliance on others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bruce Rayner

Section Potential land for development 49 - Land at The Homestead, Lound Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 400

Comment Site 49

Plan indicates that housing demand may exceed supply and that there may be a requirement for a further 8,000 homes before 2036. Before large areas of the locality are built upon, are the Council certain of the requirement? It would seem irresponsible to build numerous ‘white elephants’. Is this not merely a function of the Government’s policy to build a specified number of homes but without certainty of need in this area?

Plan indicates there are already 3,141 new homes in the pipeline plus a further 633 anticipated. That would seem to be enough for the present until precise requirements are known.

Comments are:

a) Most employment is South of the river. Blundeston is to the North.
b) Transport in Blundeston is poor, there is bad road access and it is dangerous even with low traffic. Sites 164-165 are better served.
c) Site does not benefit from obvious safe and easy access.
d) Why spoil such a beautiful area, enjoyed by tourists, local runners and cyclists? Further traffic would be a hazard.
e) As a Chartered Surveyor, your numbers per hectare do not appear to be accurate.
f) There are no amenities in Blundeston, not even a village shop for milk, bread, etc.
g) There is no regular bus service. Increased traffic to get in and out of the village is an environmental issue. Areas identified South of Lowestoft are already served by public transport and allocated safe cycle routes.
h) Properties in Blundeston are mature. New homes next to what are already new homes in Carlton Colville would be much better.
i) By publishing this document you seem to have added planning blight to nearly all of the homes surrounding Lowestoft for no apparent reason.
j) Building 456 new homes in Blundeston would almost double the population of the village, surely not desirable, sensible or necessary.
k) Current essential services /supply are limited. At certain times of the day, water pressure is very low.
l) Risk of flooding through rainfall if a concrete jungle is built - sewers can’t cope.
m) Broadband is slow and mobile phone signal is bad.

n) Development on the prison site is already ample for the village to cope with.

o) Blundeston is inhabited by lots of wildlife - there are owls, newts, hedgehogs, etc. I've heard baby owls calling to their parents from our house. Some of these species are becoming rare. Why destroy these areas when there are alternatives?

It makes far more sense to build on the sites identified in Carlton Colville. The proper infrastructure could be put in place in one designated area. Why spoil beautiful landscapes, upset huge numbers of the local population and potentially decrease tourism and enjoyment of the areas outlined.
**Comment**

I appreciate the council have to fulfil their development plans but feel strongly that this shouldn't be to the detriment of village life. Blundeston has a strong rural background but is slowly being eroded away by developments on Greenfield areas. The proposed seventeen houses for this site would increase traffic by approximately 24-34 vehicles which would either have to come down through the village or exit the village on to Flixton road (60mph speed limit) at a junction which is located on a blind bend.

I struggle to see how the council would think this was acceptable. Surely the council should be looking more at locations such as the old prison site in Blundeston that is a Brownfield site and obviously requires redevelopment. This site is of substantial size and I feel that this would be more than enough development for Blundeston at this present time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 49 - Land at The Homestead, Lound Road, Blundeston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to Historic Park and Garden - Somerleyton Park. Potential impact upon the Park and its setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 49 - Land at The Homestead, Lound Road, Blundeston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Site 49 for 17 houses would appear to again have access problems, as this corner is extremely dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Doylend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 49 - Land at The Homestead, Lound Road, Blundeston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Sites 27, 129, 49, same main reason of extra traffic as sites mentioned above. Sites 20 and 63 are better situated with access from Flixton Road, which would keep extra vehicles away from village, but still too many houses proposed for sites, these could potentially create an extra 600 vehicles on small roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alan Yardy

Section Potential land for development 49 - Land at The Homestead, Lound Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 442

Comment This site and its frontage to Lound Road suffer from significant surface water drainage problems. During winter periods surface water, from this site, floods the Public Footpath which runs from Lound Road to the Flixton Road and no adequate drainage arrangement exists. Any proposed development should address this matter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tim caley</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 50 - Land at the junction of Copland Way and the A146, North Cove

Charlotte Sanderson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 50 - Land at the junction of Copland Way and the A146, North Cove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Not a sustainable place to build 69 houses. The occupants would be completely reliant on a car as there are no services in the area. This will contribute to a characterless ribbon development between Lowestoft and Beccles along the already overloaded A146.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Historic England Debbie Mack**

**Section**  
Potential land for development S0 - Land at the junction of Copland Way and the A146, North Cove

**Comment ID**  
1021

**Comment**  
Proximity to Church of St Botolph, grade I listed to the north and grade II Three Horseshoes Public House. Potential impact upon setting high grade and other listed buildings.
Nicky Elliott

Section  
Potential land for development S0 - Land at the junction of Copland Way and the A146, North Cove

Comment ID  
472

Comment  
I feel this land should not be developed as it is away from any existing facilities and services and other residential areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
<td>Potential land for development 50 - Land at the junction of Copland Way and the A146, North Cove</td>
<td>Any development along the line of the A146 is going to add to the overloading of this road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Blankley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development S0 - Land at the junction of Copland Way and the A146, North Cove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>There can be no logic to building housing on this site. It is too close to the industrial area, and too far from existing housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Section Potential land for development 50 - Land at the junction of Copland Way and the A146, North Cove

Comment ID 1211

Comment The county council welcomes the reference to the Beccles South Relief Road and encourages the district authority to mark the route on the Beccles site map. Subject to any further assessments, the proposed level of growth around Beccles is generally acceptable with the exception of the following sites 124, 50, 71, and 77 since these are all further out from the town centre and less likely to encourage sustainable travel choices.
Potential land for development 51 - Land at The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Oulton

Adam Skinner

Section: Potential land for development 51 - Land at The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Oulton

Comment ID: 223

Comment: this land is suitable for development and has pretty good transport links and facilities. The school should take more pupils from local area rather than half way across town
Annette Collen
Gill Griffiths

Section
Potential land for development 51 - Land at The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Oulton

Comment ID
776

Comment
We have the following additional points to make in respect of site 51, Land at The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Oulton, NR32 5DP

Point 1 - To improve the health and well-being of the local population:
The site has easy access to local services and facilities being on the edge of the established settlement. A couple of convenience stores and a primary school are within easy walking distance of the site. There is a bus stop less than 100 yards from the site entrance and a doctors surgery, train station (Oulton Broad North) and the new Enterprise Zone at Mobbs Way are all accessible on foot or by bicycle.
A public footpath runs along the side of the site down to marshes and open countryside.

Point 4 - To improve access to key services and facilities:
The site has two separate access leading on to the public highway which are used by the existing dwelling, one leading onto Church Avenue towards Camps Heath and the other onto Church Lane.
There are no existing public rights of way over the site. However there is a footpath which runs alongside the Church Lane entrance to the site and affords access to the Church and marshes.

Oulton Primary School is less than a minutes walk from the Church Road site entrance and there is a post office and newsagents within walking distance of the site. The Peto Way Retail Park is approximately 5 minutes by car from the site and is also accessible by bus.
There are a number of nearby public bus services, the closest bus stops being at the end of Sands Lane. The buses provide regular connections to Lowestoft, Great Yarmouth, Southwold and beyond. The two Oulton Broad stations both provide good links to Norwich, Ipswich and the wider rail network.

Primary access would be from the Church Lane entrance.
Policy 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") refers to the need for LPA’s to take local circumstances into account (which in this case include the new energy related jobs at the Lowestoft Port and creation of the nearby Enterprise Zone at Mobbs Way) to respond to different opportunities to achieve sustainable development.
Development of site 51 would assist with the provision of much needed housing for the influx of people that is anticipated will be moving into the district in the next decade in connection with initiatives such as the Waveney energy hub and Mobbs Way Enterprise Zone.

Point 6 – To meet the housing requirements of the whole community:

The NPPF places great emphasis on sustainable development and it is a fundamental requirement of development proposals that they satisfy the three principles of sustainability, social, economic and environmental, as set out in paragraph 7 of the framework.

Section 6 of the NPPF places a requirement on Local Planning authorities to:

"...use their evidence base to ensure Local plans meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, s far s is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to he delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period."

Additional requirements of the NPPF are the need for sites to be deliverable and developable. To be considered deliverable, "...sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that the development site is viable".

To be considered developable "...sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at this point envisaged".

It is our view that this complies with all of these specific requirements.

The WDC Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment Methodology Consultation Document – Oct 2015 repeats the requirements of the NPPF in terms of assessing whether sites are Deliverable or Developable.

In this document "deliverable sites" are defined as sites which are suitable, available now and achievable within five years. Site no 51, comprising land at The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Oulton meets all of these requirements. "Developable sites" are described as sites which are suitable with a reasonable prospect that they could be available and achievable within the plan period.

The document states that a site will normally be considered "Available" if it is within the ownership of a developer who has expressed an intention to develop / sell the land for development. This site meets this requirement. A site will be considered "Achievable" where there is reasonable prospect that development will occur on the site at a particular time. A key factor is the economic viability of the site. Influences include market attractiveness, the location of the site and any abnormal constraints on the site. Oulton is a
very popular place to live, which commands an extremely strong position in the local housing market. There are no known abnormal constraints on developing this site. We consider therefore this site meets the requirements that allow it to be considered achievable.

Point 7 – To maintain air quality:
Proximity to the town centre and pedestrian / cyclist routes should mean less traffic movements than there would be with an out of town development.

Point 8 – To maintain and improve water quality:
Anglian Water has confirmed there is capacity in the nearby sewerage treatment network and foul drainage systems for development in this area. Surface water disposal would be covered in the design brief.

Point 9 – To conserve and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of landscape and townscapes:
The potential of the site for housing would be optimised by building a small number of high quality houses to fit in with the secluded woodland surroundings, enabling the preservation of the many trees, fauna and wildlife. This is in accordance with the stated aims of Policy 58 of the NPPF which refers to planning policies and decisions aiming to optimise the potential of sites. Policy 159 of the NPPF refers specifically to LPA’s identifying a scale and mix of housing. This development (which could include self build) would be an alternative to large estate type development and could address the needs of some of the people who wish to build their own homes.

Policy 69 of the NPPF refers to the promotion of healthy communities and to planning policies and decisions which achieve places providing safe and accessible environments and ensure that established shops, facilities and services can develop and modernise and be retained for the benefit of the community. A small-scale development on site 51 would support and bring more custom to local businesses without overloading existing infrastructure or causing the need for any major infrastructure works.

The site is very close to a number of existing residential developments, including Sands Lane, Woods Lane, Church Lane, Whiting Road etc. The trees bounding the site would provide an effective screen stopping the development having any impact on the existing local landscape. The site could be totally discreet. The existing house on the site would use the rear access onto Church Avenue.

Point 10 - To reduce contributions to climate change and mitigate the effects:
Travel by car is not essential from this site with it’s close proximity to the towns of Oulton Broad and Lowestoft and good transport links to Great
Yarmouth, Norwich and Beccles.

Point 11 – To consider natural resources:
The land is low quality grassland which is too small to be economically viable for use as a small holding. It has been used for occasional grazing in the past. NPPF 112 refers to local planning authorities prioritising areas of poorer quality land for development in preference to higher quality agricultural land.

Point 12 – To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity:
The site stands high and there is no flood risk to the site. Development strategy would ensure the is no offsite flood risk either. Appropriate measures will be taken at the design stage to allow for drainage from the site.

Policy 101 of the NPPF refers to new development being steered towards areas with the lowest probability of flooding.

The intention would be to develop the site without loss or removal of ANY significant trees or woodland and on a scale "appropriate to its location" in accordance with policy 120 of the NPPF. The aim would be to "promote the preservation, restoration and recreation of priority habitats, ecological networks and priority species populations" thereby conserving and enhancing biodiversity. The retention and improvement of Annabel's Spinney would be an integral part of any design brief.

Point 14 – To achieve sustained and realistic economic growth.

Economic growth generally would be stimulated by the provision of a choice of homes near to the town, business parks and Enterprise Zone. NPPF policy 23 requires LPA's to recognize town centres as being the heart of communities and requires policies which support their viability and vitality. The forecast in Waneney's core strategy was for over 5,000 new jobs in the district by 2025.

The adopted Core Strategy (CS) identified a need for 6,960 homes to be built in Waveney between 2001-2025 at an average rate of 290/ year. The WDC AMR 2014/2015 confirms that the total number of dwellings completed up to March 31st 2015 is in line with the CS requirements but annual completions for the last couple of years have been significantly less than the annual target of 290.

The new Local Plan will cover the period up to 2036. It is acknowledged there is a need to plan for significant growth. Waveney's population is both a growing and ageing one. Between 2011 (the date of the last census) and 2036 it is forecast that the population of the district will grow by at least 8000. It has also been confirmed that more people are moving into the area than leaving it and households are getting smaller. Even with no population growth therefore there is a need to plan for more housing. The consultation
document "Options for the New Local Plan" identifies three different growth scenarios which show different levels of housing and economic growth during the local plan period. Annual housing growth could range from 308 dwellings (dw)/year, 340dw/year or 380 dw/year. The document also proposes four different options for how growth and development should be distributed throughout the district, with Lowestoft accommodating a minimum of 55% of proposed new development and potentially up to 75%. Whichever one of the options for growth outlined in the consultation document is decided, significant growth is still anticipated for Lowestoft and its environs including Oulton and Oulton Broad. Development on this existing settlement would help WDC meet its housing targets and would offer an alternative type of housing to the nearby Woods Loke development and other large scale projects and could help satisfy some of the housing needs arising from the energy and creative hub at the Lowestoft Port and at the Mobbs Way Enterprise Zone. An established local developer has committed to the early development of the site, subject to a satisfactory Planning Permission. Policy 14 of the NPPF requires LPA's to "positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area". The development itself will create new jobs during the construction phase and provide opportunity for a range of associated service providers once complete. Point 16 – To enhance the viability and vitality of town centres. Policy 23 of the NPPF refers to the promotion of competitive town centres with more choice and offerings and to the important role played by residential development in this respect. Increased town centre investment would be encouraged by increased footfall and from new spend from nearby housing developments in locations such as site 51, where travel links and routes are easy. Policy 24 of the NPPF refers to preference being given in out of town centre proposals to "accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre". Site 51 satisfies both of these requirements. Point 17 – To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth The site is within cycling distance of existing employment areas including Peto Way Retail Park, Mobbs Way and the new Mobbs Way Enterprise Zone.
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section  Potential land for development S1 - Land at The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Oulton

Comment ID  865

Comment  Sites 18/53/51 Camps Heath area. There are existing pressures on Oulton Broad marshes relating to land use. I believe there is an article 4 direction on the land now. Additional housing may add to these pressures as well on the marshes as a recreational resource.
Environment Agency

Section  Potential land for development S1 - Land at The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Oulton

Comment ID  1147

Comment  We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:
Source Protection Zone 3
*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).
**Historic England Debbie Mack**

**Section**  
Potential land for development S1 - Land at The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Oulton

**Comment ID**  
1022

**Comment**  
Close to Church of St Michael, grade I listed building. Potential impact upon setting of high grade listed building (though maybe screened by The Spinney)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development S1 - Land at The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | • Sites not suitable for development:  
51 Land at the Old Rectory, Church Lane  
We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure. |
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development S1 - Land at The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Oulton

Comment ID 728

Comment Sites 18; 23; 51; 53 and 96 are in close proximity of areas of sensitive wetland habitat including Oulton Marshes CWS and Dairy Farm Marshes CWS. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact nearby sensitive areas.
Potential land for development 52 - Land at Toodley Farm, Station Road, Brampton with Stoven

Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  Potential land for development 52 - Land at Toodley Farm, Station Road, Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID  1023

Comment  Proximity of Shingle Hall and Brampton Old Hall, both grade II listed. Potential impact on settings of listed buildings.
Potential land for development 53 - Land between Church Lane and Church Avenue, Oulton

Broads Authority Natalie Beal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 53 - Land between Church Lane and Church Avenue, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Sites 18/53/51 Camps Heath area. There are existing pressures on Oulton Broad marshes relating to land use. I believe there is an article 4 direction on the land now. Additional housing may add to these pressures as well on the marshes as a recreational resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development S3 - Land between Church Lane and Church Avenue, Oulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**       | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints: Source Protection Zone 3  
*Source Protection Zone* - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development S3 - Land between Church Lane and Church Avenue, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Close to Church of St Michael, grade I listed building. Potential impact upon setting of high grade listed building (though maybe screened by The Spinney)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Messrs Munnings and Jermy
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section | Potential land for development 53 - Land between Church Lane and Church Avenue, Oulton
Comment ID | 769
Comment

1.0 The "Initial sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" is encouraging in that there are several positive points:
- Improving health and wellbeing
- Improvement to access to key services
- Meeting housing requirements
- Encouraging efficient patterns of movement and Economic growth

Whilst the only negative points identified relate to:
(a) Conserving distinctive landscape
(b) Conserving Natural Resources
(c) To reduce contribution to climate change and mitigate effects"

With regard to (a) & (b) it is inevitable that there will be negative issues around these based on potential use of Greenfield land, but this situation applies to the vast majority of sites being promoted through the overall land bid exercise.

2.0 The site offers potentially up to 48 dwellings (LPA estimate) and although largely a greenfield site it is located immediately adjacent to the built up area at the western end of Lowestoft. It is within 50 metres of the Woods Meadow residential site to the north east. (presently under construction involving Circa 800 dwellings). In any event within the present search for sites, the LPA has also recognised that greenfield development is inevitable.

3.0 As stated above, the site is adjacent to existing and proposed housing and is within walking distance of a primary school, a shop and public transport facilities. Once the Woods Meadow site is established Site 53 will be reasonably close to additional retail facilities, a community hall, medical centre, primary school, play areas and a country park; together with further public transport facilities. It is therefore in a very sustainable location. To suggest, as the LPA has done in its initial Sustainability Assessment, that a hedge on the western boundary of the Whiting estate to the east of the site forms a "natural edge" to the built form, does not take into account the existing housing stock and related development to the north, north west, south and south west, as well as the ongoing Woods Meadow development to the north east as referred to above, in the vicinity of this
the site; nor does it take into account Site 96 close to St Michaels Church to the west and much closer to the area covered by the Broads Authority. However, it is acknowledged that the surroundings to the immediate west are semi- rural and therefore a lower density development as suggested by the LPA may be more appropriate. Whilst acknowledging this position, it should also be borne in mind that Site 53 could bring about highway improvements to a concealed junction where Church Lane and Sands Lane converge close to the Oulton Broad Primary school adjacent to the site.

4.0 In acknowledging that a lower density scheme may be more suitable and given that the LPA has arrived at similar conclusions for Sites 18 & 51 to the north and south respectively, then a consolidated approach involving either or both these sites could provide a balanced, attractive and discrete development opportunity. With or without these other sites it is likely that developing Site 53 could provide highway improvements in an area close to a primary school where there is presently a blind bend where 3 roads converge.

5.0 The Council predicts that at least 7700 new homes will be needed up to 2036. Indeed the LPA recognises that this figure could be as high as 9500; and therefore there is considerable pressure to release additional housing land. The LPA has also indicated that 630 dwellings have been built throughout the district between 2011 and 2015. This equates to 158 per annum. Taking the lower figure above (7700) the requirement is 308 per annum (over the 25 year period between 2011 & 2036), whilst the highest figure represents the need for 380 per year.

6.0 Notwithstanding the fact that there are planning permissions in place for over 3000 dwellings and a further 633 included in allocated sites, nonetheless as illustrated by the Lake Lothing situation, there is some doubt over the ability to deliver the required housing. The fact that the Council is still seeking further sites at present reinforces this position and it follows that there will be likely to be a significant shortfall; and therefore there is even greater need to promote sites which are available, viable and deliverable in accordance with Para 47 of the NPPF.

7.0 Concentrating on Site 53 on its own merits, it is also understood that there are no viability issues and therefore development could be delivered swiftly, and in so doing help to contribute towards the required 5YHLS and its Housing Strategy, with the support of the LPA.
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section  Potential land for development 53 - Land between Church Lane and Church Avenue, Oulton

Comment ID  964

Comment  • Sites not suitable for development:
53 Land between Church Lane and Church Avenue
We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure.
**Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 53 - Land between Church Lane and Church Avenue, Oulton

**Comment ID**  
729

**Comment**  
Sites 18; 23; 51; 53 and 96 are in close proximity of areas of sensitive wetland habitat including Oulton Marshes CWS and Dairy Farm Marshes CWS. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact nearby sensitive areas.
Potential land for development 54 - Land between Harbour Road and the west end of the old Shell site, Lowestoft

Peter Eyres

Section Potential land for development 54 - Land between Harbour Road and the west end of the old Shell site, Lowestoft

Comment ID 639

Comment This site includes a public footpath along the shore of Lake Lothing and a well-established but informal cycle track along the top of the bank, beside the railway line, from the footbridge over the railway to Harbour Road. In any development, this route must be included as a formal cycle route: it is the landing for the proposed cycle/pedestrian bridge over the railway from behind Constable Close and it will connect to the proposed cycle/pedestrian bridge from Brooke Peninsula (p. 16 of consultation document).
### Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 54 - Land between Harbour Road and the west end of the old Shell site, Lowestoft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Based on aerial photographs, sites 54; 84; and 129 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 55 - Land between Pilgrim's Way and Wingfield Street, Bungay

Anonymous

Section  Potential land for development 55 - Land between Pilgrim's Way and Wingfield Street, Bungay

Comment ID  213

Comment  Places labelled 55, 37 on the Bungay development map are areas not very well set up with infrastructure, they include already very built up urban areas. With this the land on St Johns Hill (45) would better be suited for housing and other leisure facilities.
Didy Ward

Section Potential land for development 55 - Land between Pilgrim’s Way and Wingfield Street, Bungay

Comment ID 100

Comment This is designated as allotment land. There is no vehicular access to the land and potential access points at Wingfield Street or Pilgrims Way would cause nuisance and congestion. The land floods on the south side. The drainage serving the houses on St. John's Road, immediately next to the site, have long-standing drainage problems. Any development on this land would exacerbate that.

Speculative plans were brought by the owner to Bungay Town Council a few years ago for a nursing home for people with dementia and a few ‘allotment’ sites on the south side (where it floods) offered as a sop to the town. It was also stated at the time that this would bring jobs to the town as carers would be needed. However the owner runs a business which provides care workers to nursing homes, recruited primarily from Eastern Europe. This was not disclosed at the presentation to the Town Council.

The only thing the owner has done to the land since purchasing it is fell the fruit and other trees that were on it (during nesting season). But as wild land it offers habitat for wildlife and a 'green lung' for all of the residential areas which surround the land.

WDC has always been adamant that this land should remain as allotment land. I sincerely hope that this will remain the case. The only other allotment land in Bungay is at Flixton Road where there are insufficient plots to meet demand.
As you will be aware, my client, Halsbury Homes, submitted details of the above site in response to your 'Call for Sites' in Autumn 2015, and it is shown as potential land for development in the 'Help plan our future: options for the new Waveney Local Plan' document which is currently out for consultation (Site 55).

The site is presently allocated under Policy BUN5 for Allotments/Open Space in the Waveney Site Allocations Development Plan Document. I note from the supporting text that the land "has been protected for allotment use and an important open space in the built up area for many years." The supporting text also notes that "most of the site falls within an area of medium flood risk (flood zone 2), taking into account climate change." Whilst site 55 has not been formally assessed for its potential for residential development, RPS is given to understand these are the two principal areas of concern that the Local Planning Authority has in relation to ability of this site to yield much needed housing.

The Local Planning Authority's aspirations in terms of creating allotments on this site are understood, although, the site has stood derelict for many years since the site was last used, and efforts to realise these ambitions since the Waveney Site Allocations Development Plan Document was adopted in 2011 have been unsuccessful. Halsbury Homes has the controlling interest in the land at St. Johns Road, and there is now no realistic long-term prospect of the site being returned to allotment use.

In terms of flood risk, I have consulted the Environment Agency's Flood Map (extract enclosed). This shows clearly that the whole site is in flood zone 1 (less than a 0.1 per cent (1 in 1000) chance of flooding occurring each year).

The Local Planning Authority's concerns about Site 55 are therefore without foundation.

Bungay is one of the principal settlements in the District where under Policy CS01 of the Core Strategy, it is classified as a market town which, along with Beccles, Worlingham, Halesworth and Southwold, will accommodate approximately 15-25% of the District's housing growth.

The site is approximately 400m to the south east of town centre, which has...
a good range of shops and other services and facilities. Site 55 is therefore in a sustainable location within a sustainable settlement, and it is considered that there are no sound planning reasons why the site could not come forward during the Local Plan period. I would therefore welcome the opportunity to discuss with how this site could contribute to meeting the District’s objectively assessed housing needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 55 - Land between Pilgrim's Way and Wingfield Street, Bungay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Adjacent to Bungay Conservation Area, 14 Wingfield Street Grade II and close to 5-11 Wingfield Street, also Grade II. Potential impact on Conservation Area and setting of Listed Buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hazelwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 55 - Land between Pilgrim’s Way and Wingfield Street, Bungay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>This site is one of the last remaining open spaces in the town and should not be considered for housing. The site should be reserved for recreational/amenities use for future generations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 55 - Land between Pilgrim’s Way and Wingfield Street, Bungay

Comment ID 746

Comment Based on aerial photographs, sites 37 and 55 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.
Tracey Holmes

Section Potential land for development S5 - Land between Pilgrim’s Way and Wingfield Street, Bungay

Comment ID 122

Comment
This site is always coming up for discussion for development. My Mum lives on St Johns Rd and she has the following concerns.

1. When the Pilgrims Way development was built, the builders elevated the ground and disposed of the ditch which always ran around this field with no thought for the local residents. As a result, though it NEVER did before, when it rains, my Mum’s garden now floods. If the old allotment field was to be built on and they again elevated the field (as like the old Watts field onto which Pilgrims way was built, the allotment field is also the lowest point) then surplus water would go onto surrounding properties and the flooding would be horrendous.

2. There is no decent access to the site. The lane to the allotments is too narrow and privately owned. Wingfield St is too narrow to support even more traffic and there is a school there. Access through Pilgrims Way means even more traffic coming out of the junction onto St Johns Rd which is already lethal - my niece has just had an accident there - caused partly because of the cars parked outside residences at around no 41 St Johns Rd onwards - when Pilgrims way was built the front gardens were purchased so that there was better visibility coming out of Pilgrims way and the residents were given garages at the bottoms of the gardens so they could park their cars there and of course they dont. So that junction woudl be even busier and still lethal.

My own thought is that this field should be given to the town as a recreation area, as there is no piece of nice green land (except for the Castle Hills) where residents and especially children can go to relax and play football.
Potential land for development 56 - Land between Rushmere Road and Fairhead Loke, Gisleham

Gisleham Parish Council Derek Ward

Section Potential land for development 56 - Land between Rushmere Road and Fairhead Loke, Gisleham

Comment ID 663

Comment Gisleham Parish Council asks that consideration be given to the following comments and observations in respect of the possible allocation of land for the development of 110 properties. This parcel of land adjoins farmland and the proposed entrance onto Rushmere Road is a busy road and the only access to the site is on a blind bend which cars travelling from Henstead, Rushmere and Mutford use to access the South Lowestoft Industrial Estate and the town centre.

1) ROAD - As mentioned above this is a busy rural road and to access the possible site of 110 properties which could produce more than 200 cars is unacceptable. The road could be widened by taking land from the school playing field and a small section of farmland to the south. This would however increase the speed of traffic entering a built up area, and the dangers arising from this could be considerable.

2) FOOTPATH - There is no footpath from the site until Carter's Garage is reached some distance from the site entrance. There are properties along this stretch of road, but in some cases the front gardens are close to the existing carriageway.

3) FLOODING - Rushmere Road regularly floods at times of heavy rains, close to where the site entrance might be; this water could drain towards the properties and there is a possibility that properties could be affected.

4) SEWERAGE - The Parish Council is not currently aware of any problems with the current system, but this may not be the case if a large number of properties are to be built in this location.

5) INFRASTRUCTURE - Carlton Colville Primary School would not cope with what could be an extra 150 or more pupils, and would have to be extended and this would exacerbate the parking problems both in Gisleham Road and Rushmere Road. There are two doctors’ surgeries but again there are not sufficient doctors available for current needs or indeed for a large influx of patients. There are small local shops in Famona Road, but their premises
are totally inadequate for an increase in population in the area and the services at these shops are limited. Potential customers would need to drive to these shops where there is little parking and the traffic flow along Rushmere Road to The Street is not suitable for this increase.

6) ENVIRONMENT - Construction for this size of development is potentially around 20 to 24 months, this road would not cope with the disruption that this would cause bearing in mind the proximity to the school and the width of the carriageway. There are no known particular habitats for wildlife, but there is an area of 'set aside' along the eastern boundary which is potentially an area for small mammals and birds and various varieties of flowering plant providing much needed food for bees and other insects. There are bats in the locality.

7) LIGHTING - This site is some distance away from development, and adjoins open farmland, to install the necessary lighting would cause excessive light pollution thus taking away another section of night sky from the rural countryside. The Parish Council asks that these concerns are taken into account and considered very carefully when your department decides upon the future of this parcel of land.
The "Initial sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" paper is encouraging in that the only negative points identified relate to:
(A) "conserving and enhancing the quality and distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes"
(B) "reducing contributions to climate change and mitigate effects"
(C) "Conserving natural resources"

In response to item (A), whilst this is certainly a matter for consideration, we believe this potential issue can be addressed by the implementation of strategic landscaping in association with any future development, as well as the inclusion of attractive open space. With regard to items (B) and (C), considering Site 56 is Greenfield land, it is often the case that potential issues can be identified in relation to these matters, however given the scale and situation of the site, we believe that a potential development could be designed to involve particular features and infrastructure improvements to mitigate and counteract these potential issues.

The site extends to approximately 5.58 hectares and could accommodate up to approximately 165 dwellings (based on an assumed 30 dwellings per hectare). The site is within the sole ownership of our client and is considered suitable, available and deliverable in the next 1-5 years.

The site is potentially accessible to the north via Fairhead Loke, subject to some highways improvement works, and is currently accessible via Rushmere Road to the south. It is adjacent to Carlton Colville Primary School and is situated within cycling and walking distance from Lowestoft, a key area for prospective employment growth over the coming plan period. There may be some potential synergies between the development of the site and a possible solution to the existing traffic congestion issues associated with Carlton Colville Primary School, which could involve some of our client’s further land holding to the south of the school. This potential strategy has, to date, only been discussed in principle, and is a matter that requires further attention in due course.

Subsequent to the previous narrative, we consider the site to represent a sustainable opportunity for development and we look forward to continued engagement with the emerging Local Plan process in relation to this site.
Mr & Mrs W Deal

Section
Potential land for development 56 - Land between Rushmere Road and Fairhead Loke, Gisleham

Comment ID
255

Comment
This site is directly opposite the local middle school.
Site access would need to be onto a country road which is narrow, has poor visibility and is subject to regular parking to the adjacent school. A new access would aggravate this situation causing further parking problems and congestion.
Where would foul and surface water discharge to? The latter would probably end up in Kirkley Stream which regularly causes flooding in the area.
Can the local school accommodate the additional children that would be generated from this proposal?
The site appears to be outside of the natural development area of the neighbourhood & would encroach into open countryside.
# Potential land for development 57 - Land between The Street and A146, Barnby

**Barnby Parish Council Ian Hinton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 57 - Land between The Street and A146, Barnby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Also a large site, but perhaps development of part of this site might be the best of a bad bunch, to help alleviate overall demand for new housing and &quot;satisfy&quot; Barnby's contribution, as it does not require all traffic to pass through the village to access the site – currently farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 57 - Land between The Street and A146, Barnby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site currently in agricultural use. The size of the site is inappropriate to the size of the village - there is insufficient infrastructure to support a large development of this type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Broads Authority Natalie Beal**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 57 - Land between The Street and A146, Barnby

**Comment ID**  
856

**Comment**  
Group of sites around Barnby/North Cove – In addition to potential impacts on landscape character (LCAS) and visual amenity for users of the Broads, further development of housing has the potential to increase the recreational pressures on the Broads.
Charlotte Sanderson

Section | Potential land for development S7 - Land between The Street and A146, Barnby

Comment ID | 601

Comment
* The scale of this development is far too big.
* The development of 52 homes would further add to the suburbanisation of this area.
* 52 homes would place pressure on the struggling existing sewage infrastructure.
* Barnby has no village shop, few places of employment, and no surgery. The school is full.
* The occupants of the new development would be reliant on their car, which is not sustainable. It is my view that this development is likely to add a further 104 cars regularly joining the A146 (and add a likely 156 extra vehicle movements a day). There would be greater likelihood of collisions, and increased levels of air pollution close to the village school.
* There would be increased light pollution in this part of village with the addition of security lights and potentially street lights.
* The scale of this development would contribute to a characterless ribbon development between Lowestoft and Beccles along the already overloaded A146.
* I feel that this development would set an unacceptable precedent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julie Reid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robert Gill

Section  Potential land for development S7 - Land between The Street and A146, Barnby

Comment ID  236

Comment  This site is outside the current physical limits of development in Barnby. Previous development plan consultations have proposed the use of this site and each time this has been vigorously opposed by the local population and we anticipate the same response this time. We strongly oppose the inclusion of this site.

Building on this site will:
- detract from the rural environment
- significantly increase traffic to an already dangerous junction
- overstretch the limited facilities and infrastructure of the village, including the school
- there are no shops in Barnby or North Cove
- the site is productive farm land
- the site is adjacent to a busy main road and it is questionable how attractive houses would be to potential purchasers

Barnby is subject to flooding. The planning application on a nearby site has been delayed due to Environment Agency concerns about flooding.
Potential land for development 58 - Land east of 17-25 Sotherton Corner, Sotherton / Wangford with Henham

Claire Thurlow

Section
Potential land for development 58 - Land east of 17-25 Sotherton Corner, Sotherton / Wangford with Henham

Comment ID
545

Comment
This very rural site totally unsustainable for housing purposes. There is no bus service, mains sewerage, and the road is narrow and already subject to congestion from lorries to the farm, commuters to the Bernard Mathews factory. The lack of sufficient off road parking at the Council properties makes negotiating the village very difficult when school buses and bin lorries are present. The area is also a wildlife haven with trees, hedges and farm land linking small blocks of woodland. The row of old traditional farm workers cottages numbers 19 -23 have been popular holiday lets and bring tourism and income into the area. Several have recently sold to return to holiday lets. Development of the land in front of the cottages (they are at a right angle to the lane and over look the plot) would devalue these properties and drive tourism out of Sotherton.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Historic England Debbie Mack</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mary Saward

Section Potential land for development 58 - Land east of 17-25 Sotherton Corner, Sotherton / Wangford with Henham

Comment ID 516

Comment The following considerations seem relevant to the possible development at site number 58 (Sotherton Corner):
1. There are no amenities whatsoever at Sotherton Corner. This would inevitably result in car journeys for all services such as schools and shopping.
2. The site can be approached only by minor roads which are narrow and currently in poor repair. In many places the roads in the immediate vicinity of Sotherton Corner are single file.
3. From a subjective point of view, the indicative number of homes (54) is approximately twice the number of dwellings in the existing hamlet. This would fundamentally change the nature of the rural location and seems disproportionate to the site.
Sotherton Corner homeowner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosemary Parry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tim Madden

Section  
Potential land for development 58 - Land east of 17-25 Sotherton Corner, Sotherton / Wangford with Henham

Comment ID  528

Comment  
I claim a vested interest as the owner of a house immediately adjacent to the potential land for development.
I consider this proposal as inappropriate for the following reason:
1. Any development in this hamlet would be unsuitable as there is a total lack of amenities of any sort - no school, shop, church, pub, or playground.
2. There is no bus route and the nearest bus stop must be over two miles distant.
3. All approach roads are single carriageway and dangerous at the best of times when used by large agricultural machinery.
4. The proposed development size is out of all proportion to the existing size of the hamlet - currently some 24 dwellings.
5. Current owners have chosen to leave in Sotherton Corner precisely for what it is - a small, peaceful hamlet with uninterrupted rural views.
## Potential land for development 59 - Land east of Charters Piece, Willingham

**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 59 - Land east of Charters Piece, Willingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Close to Fox Farmhouse, grade II listed building to north. Potential impact on setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sotterley Estate Tom Barne**  
**Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 59 - Land east of Charters Piece, Willingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Site Description and Development Potential  
7.1 Site Option 59 is located east of Charters Piece in Willingham. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 6.  
7.2 The site is 1ha in size and is well related to the built form of the village. It is a rectangular shape and has a flat topography.  
7.3 According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 30 dwellings on this part of the site.  
7.4 More appropriately and reflecting the density of surrounding development this site would provide for around 20 dwellings (including 6 affordable homes) arranged in a manner sympathetic to the site and its location.  
7.5 The site is bounded to the west by residential development at Charters Piece and agricultural land to the north, east and south.  
Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal  
7.6 We agree with the conclusion of the Site Sustainability Assessment for this site that new development could be softened in the landscape with sensitive planting and gaps between buildings, retention of the southern boundary hedge and additional planting. |
Potential land for development 60 - Land east of College Lane, Worlingham

andy house

Section  Potential land for development 60 - Land east of College Lane, Worlingham

Comment ID  230

Comment  I do not think this site is suitable for a development of this scale as the road access is on minor roads through residential estates. The school already crowds the roads at certain times. There are few local facilities in Worlingham and direct access to those in Beccles is along Lowestoft Road which has several traffic pinch points already - rail crossing, peddars traffic lights and Blyburgate.

If college lane is seen as the main access to Beccles the right turn onto Ellough Road would require upgrading

Any significant increase in population of Worlingham would further stress the healthcare facilities at Beccles Medical Centre and the local dentists which are already difficult to access.
andy house

Section  Potential land for development 60 - Land east of College Lane, Worlingham

Comment ID  638

Comment  this is a good location providing the college lane junction with Ellough road is improved. connecting this area to lowestoft road via garden lane or rectory lane would add too much traffic to the junctions ( limited visibility) and cause problems around the school. Half the number of houses being proposed would be more in keeping with the adjoining housing density
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Potential land for development 60 - Land east of College Lane, Worlingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Worlingham Manor grade II to west. Potential impact on setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul Gurbutt

Section  Potential land for development 60 - Land east of College Lane, Worlingham

Comment ID  129

Comment  1. How do you protect the historic heart of Beccles from the increased traffic. All the developments are south of Worlingham and all the supermarkets are to the north (*) traffic blocking Beccles. The secondary schools locations (*) that cross Beccles traffic is inevitable. Larkfleet (area 82) gave no assurance of any solution to the traffic problem.
2. How do you plan for extra infrastructure? I have heard from Anglian Water that the sewage treatment works is already over stretched, without 100's more houses.
Rachael Staniul

Section  Potential land for development 60 - Land east of College Lane, Worlingham

Comment ID  881

Comment  Is a prime example of a rich wildlife habitat – birds, insects, butterflies and mammals. Hedgehogs are in serious decline due to habitat loss, and the removal of hedgerows. Covering this in concrete would be devastating for the wildlife, and would have a knock on effect for the whole area. Surely brownfield sites must be prioritised, rather than simply concreting over the countryside. We owe it to future generations to preserve such beautiful and diverse habitats, - not lose them forever.
**Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer**

**Section**
Potential land for development 60 - Land east of College Lane, Worlingham

**Comment ID**
739

**Comment**
Sites 8; 9; 44; 60; 62; 81; 82 and 89 form a large block of land which is likely to be of some value, particularly for farmland species. Careful consideration should therefore be given to the allocation of these sites for residential development, in order to ensure that it does not result in an adverse impact on the wildlife value of the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan Doherty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Worlingham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group John Coulson**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 60 - Land east of College Lane, Worlingham

**Comment ID**  
124

**Comment**  
As a resident of Worlingham my concerns are for the areas listed (82, 62, 60, 44).

- Increase in traffic
- Will local drainage be able to cope. A recent response to our Neighbourhood Plan group indicates that foul and surface water drainage is already virtually at its limit.
- What will WDC do to improve facilities in Worlingham as we currently have no village hall, pub etc.
- What will determine the number / rate of housebuilding in Worlingham?
- Can you please differentiate between Worlingham and Beccles, they are not the same place!
- Will the local plan consider a new doctors surgery in Worlingham.
- What is WDC position with the Larkfleet housing proposal. When will you have establish what growth level you will be working with?
- How will our neighbourhood plan be able to influence WDC planning?
- When do we need to have our neighbourhood plan in place to be considered in WDC planning?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 60 - Land east of College Lane, Worlingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>It was agreed that the preferred development choice for Worlingham would be the site no. 60, or if not, then no. 44 – as these would be closest to the proposed southern relief road. This was AGREED by a majority with 1 abstain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Potential land for development 61 - Land east of Copland Way, Worlingham / Ellough / North Cove

**Beccles Town Council C Boyne**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 61 - Land east of Copland Way, Worlingham / Ellough / North Cove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Beccles Town Council would back sites 61, 77 and 78 for future employment bearing in mind the access provision mentioned above and suitable power supplies which are not available at the moment.

[The road infrastructure in the area is very poor and not fit for purpose, the B1127 being a prime example as it is little more than a country lane, as is Ellough Road and most of the others. There is inadequate pedestrian and cycle access to the existing and proposed employment areas at Ellough and no bus service at all.]
1. Introduction
1.1 Waveney District Council is in the early stages of preparing a new local plan which will determine the number and location of new housing and employment sites in the District for the plan period to 2036.
1.2 As part of this process the District Council invited land owners to submit details of sites for future employment development and is now inviting comments on the sites submitted to them and questions related to the issues and options facing the district in the future.
1.3 This report responds to the Site Options map and comments made on our client’s site no.61. We have also responded to relevant questions from the consultation document and submitted these separately. The responses are included here in Appendix 1 for ease of reference.
1.4 These representations concern the part of the Ellough Industrial Estate edged in red on the inset plan below:
(MAP OF SITE)
1.5 The plans in Appendix 2 identify the site, its location and its surroundings.
1.6 Evolution Town Planning have been instructed by BKW Ltd (owners of a significant part of the Ellough Industrial Estate – the former Ellough airfield) to make representations to this public consultation.
1.7 Evolution Town Planning (ETP) are experienced in promoting employment sites either through development plan representations or planning applications and have particular experience with development on former airfields.
1.8 We also have site assessment experience from working in Council planning departments. As a practice we have 30 years of combined professional experience in this type of work.
1.9 These representations build on the information submitted to the Call for Sites consultation.
1.10 The Waveney Core Strategy's vision for Beccles states that "Beccles Business Park at Ellough will offer additional opportunities for local employment ". It goes on to say that "There is demand for more land in the area of Ellough/Beccles Business Park to accommodate the needs of larger
users for B1, B2 and B8 use [...] Progress in developing the undeveloped areas of land at Ellough will be an important consideration in determining the need to allocate further land here”.

1.11 When this Core Strategy was adopted this site was an 'undeveloped area of land' at Ellough but this is no longer the case. Recent industrial scale planning permissions have opened up the potential of this site to, potentially, the 'larger users' the Core Strategy referred to. Details of these planning permissions is given in the planning history section below.

1.12 The site has been assessed and we consider it remains suitable, available, achievable and viable taking into account relevant policy requirements and obligations.

1.13 We invite the District Council to consider the information in this report and the merits of the site to deliver sustainable employment in Waveney.

2.0 Planning Policy

2.1 The Waveney Core Strategy predates the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and more recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and as such is becoming increasingly out of step with national planning policy imperatives.

2.2 National planning policy, to which the new local plan will need to comply, is provided in paragraphs 18 to 21 of the Framework which state:

Delivering sustainable development

1. Building a strong, competitive economy

18. The Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country’s inherent strengths, and to meeting the twin challenges of global competition and of a low carbon future.

19. The Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.

20. To help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century.

21. Investment in business should not be over-burdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations. Planning policies should recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including a poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing. In drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should:

> set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth;
> set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period;
> support existing business sectors, taking account of whether they are expanding or contracting and, where possible, identify and plan for new or emerging sectors likely to locate in their area. Policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances;
> plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries;
> identify priority areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement; and
> facilitate flexible working practices such as the integration of residential and commercial uses within the same unit.

2.3 Of particular relevance from these paragraphs are the policies requiring that:
> Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth
> Local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century
> Support existing business sector, taking account of whether they are expanding or contracting
> Policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances

2.4 The Waveney New Local Plan is at an early stage and it is not yet clear how Waveney District Council will be responding to these national policy imperatives and how this will be reflected in its approach to economic development policy.

2.5 In terms of policy guidance we have had regard to policies of the adopted Core Strategy (2009), the CIL Charging Schedule, Site Allocations (2011) and the Development Management document (2011).

2.6 The Council acknowledges the need to review these adopted policy documents as part of the new Local Plan as they were based on former national planning policy priorities and predate the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

2.7 These local policy documents are adopted and, as the Council acknowledges, form a useful baseline now and we have had regard to them in the same manner.

2.8 The Framework seeks to deliver sustainable development. We consider that the assessment below shows that the further development of this site
would meet the social, environmental and economic tests for sustainable development.

3.0 The Former Airfield

History and Geographical Context

3.1 Ellough Airfield was completed in 1943 and served for a short time as an RAF Bomber Command and RAF Coastal Command airfield during the Second World War. The airfield was decommissioned after the war and the land is now an industrial estate. For a time a heliport operated to service the North Sea oil and gas rigs. A basic airstrip, known as Beccles Airport, remains on the former airfield, and is used as a training centre and private airfield.

3.2 The site is located to the south east of Beccles, within the former Ellough Airfield. It is bordered to the south and west by the B1127 which provides a link between the A12 at Wrentham and the A146 east of Beccles. To the south and east of the site, the land is predominately agricultural comprising a flat, open landscape with a mix of large and medium sized arable fields, scattered small woodlands and some field hedgerows:

(Aerial Photo showing site boundary)

3.3 The Suffolk Coasts and Heath AONB is located 1.5km to the east of the site. There are no residential properties within 1 km of the site. There are no Tree Preservation Orders affecting the site. There are no public footpaths passing through or adjacent to the site.

3.4 A poultry farm is located approximately 400m to the south of the site. This comprises a series of 12 large (80m x 25m) single storey buildings.

3.5 A remnant runway is located to the eastern edge of the proposed site, running in a northwest-southeast direction.

3.6 To the north west of the site, there is a substantial area of mixed commercial/industrial buildings comprising Ellough Industrial Park, Beccles Business Park and Moore Business Park. These include several large scale industrial buildings (up to 150m long and 5-12m tall) which form prominent features in the local landscape.

4.0 Site Planning History

4.1 The site has the following planning permissions associated with it. Those in bold have been implemented:

> Discharge of Condition nos 7, 8 and 9 of DC/14/2634/FUL - Engineering operation to construct a digestate storage lagoon, plus operational development of access road and boundary. Land Off Copland Way Worlingham Beccles Ref. No: DC/15/1875/DRC | Received: Fri 08 May 2015 | Validated: Mon 11 May 2015 | Status: Application Permitted

> Engineering operation to construct a digestate storage lagoon, plus operational development of access road and boundary fencing. Land Off
Options for the new Waveney Local Plan | Consultation responses

Copland Way Worlingham Beccles Suffolk NR34 7TL Ref. No: DC/14/2634/FUL | Received: Thu 14 Aug 2014 | Validated: Thu 14 Aug 2014 | Status: Application Permitted
> Construction of a compound to house network entry and gas flow metering equipment for adjacent anaerobic digestion plant. Land East Of Copland Way Worlingham Suffolk Ref. No: DC/13/3804/FUL | Received: Fri 20 Dec 2013 | Validated: Thu 30 Jan 2014 | Status: Application Permitted
> Construction of grain storage and processing buildings including erection of 14no. silos and new vehicular access. Land East Of Copland Way Worlingham Suffolk Ref. No: DC/13/3796/FUL | Received: Fri 20 Dec 2013 | Validated: Tue 24 Dec 2013 | Status: Application Permitted
> Discharge of Condition nos 7, 8, 9, 11 and 18 of DC/11/0670/FUL - Construction of an anaerobic digestion plant and associated buildings and structures - details of prevention of discharge water entering the highway, details of vehicle turning within the site, archaeological report, land contamination report and details of surface water drainage system. Land East Of Copland Way Worlingham Suffolk. Ref. No: DC/13/0299/DRC | Received: Mon 18 Mar 2013 | Validated: Tue 19 Mar 2013 | Status: Application Permitted
> Construction of grain storage and processing buildings including the erection of 14no. silos and new vehicular access. Land East Of Copland Way Worlingham Suffolk. Ref. No: DC/12/1475/FUL | Received: Wed 12 Dec 2012 | Validated: Mon 17 Dec 2012 | Status: Application Permitted
> Provision of open storage for minerals. Old Runway East Of Copland Way Worlingham Beccles Suffolk. Ref. No: DC/06/1400/FUL | Received: Fri 08 Dec 2006 | Validated: Fri 08 Dec 2006 | Status: Temporary Permission Granted
> Construction of link road and associated landscaping. Land Between Lowestoft Road (A146) And Benacre Road (B1127) Ellough. Ref. No:
DC/88/1195/FUL | Received: Mon 05 Dec 1988 | Validated: Mon 05 Dec 1988 | Status: Application Permitted
> O/A Industrial development & construction of Ellough link road. Land Between Lowestoft Road (A146) & Benacre Road (B1127) Ellough (East Of Ellough Industrial Estate). Ref. No: DC/87/1601/OUT | Received: Mon 14 Dec 1987 | Validated: Mon 14 Dec 1987 | Status: Application Permitted

4.2 The recent planning history in particular demonstrates that the principle of development is now established on this site.

4.3 The scale and complexity of these developments and the principle they establish in terms of appropriateness of location for emissions, traffic, scale, bulk and height etc. lends them to be accompanied, or in time replaced, by other complimentary employment, commercial and industrial uses.

5.0 Site Option 61 Land East of Copland Way

Site Description and Development Potential

5.1 The site is located in the centre of the former Ellough Airfield, to the east of Copland Way. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 2.

5.2 The site is 16.3ha in size and is well related to the wider industrial estate and local transport network. The site has a significant frontage onto Copland Way and the B1127.

5.3 The site includes a consented anaerobic digestion plant which has seen subsequent planning permissions for a storage lagoon and National Grid connection compound. Construction is well underway on the anaerobic digestion plant and is nearing completion on all elements.

5.4 There is also an extant planning permission for a large scale commercial grain store and a temporary planning permission for aggregate storage on the former runway to the east.

5.5 The areas of these planning permissions total some 6.7ha. There is therefore 9.6ha remaining undeveloped currently. This is shown on the inset plan below. As can be seen it consists of the former runway to the east and an area in the south of the site:

(Map showing site boundary, currently available land, AD plant, grain store and CWS).

5.6 The site is bounded to the west by commercial and industrial development, the east by the former runway, the southeast by the RainAir airstrip, the south by the B1127 and the poultry farm further south. Beyond that is the crematorium and consented major solar farm.

5.7 The recent planning consents on this site demonstrate its development potential.

Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal

5.8 The Site Sustainability Assessment (SSA) at Point 12 states that
"development could result in the loss of a County Wildlife Site". This was not the intention of the plan submitted at the call for sites stage. For the avoidance of doubt we have provided an amended version of the plan E422/BKW1 with this report which excludes the County Wildlife Site. The site should not score 0 (neutral) against this criteria.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 This report promotes a site at the Ellough Industrial Estate for employment use in response to the new Local Plan Issues and Options consultation.

6.2 The former airfield has seen its commercial and industrial offer increase over time and additional land is required, especially for larger users, according to the Core Strategy.

6.3 This site already includes planning permissions for large scale industrial development. Therefore the development potential of this land is open to further exploitation and this may put it ahead of other sites nearby which remain empty.

6.4 We have reviewed national and local planning policy and guidance and have visited the site and toured the area on many occasions. We have considered the site against the criteria set out in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment consultation methodology (Oct 2015).

6.5 Our site assessment shows that the site remains suitable, available and (subject to addressing utilities capacity issues locally) it is achievable.

6.6 An allocation for development would therefore meet the economic, social and environmental principle of sustainable development.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section  Potential land for development 61 - Land east of Copland Way, Worlingham / Ellough / North Cove

Comment ID  734

Comment  Site 61 includes Ellough Airfield CWS. We therefore consider that this site should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on either the CWS.
Potential land for development 62 - Land east of Ellough Road, Worlingham

**Comment ID** 635

**Comment**
This is a good site for development as it already has road, cycle and footpath links. The number of houses is too big - perhaps half the site could be for housing and the remainder for commercial (car home, sheltered housing village or sports amenity)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Historic England Debbie Mack</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jay

Section  Potential land for development 62 - Land east of Ellough Road, Worlingham

Comment ID  424

Comment  Traffic
Ellough road is currently very busy at peak times – this will only get worse with 360+ cars added at these times. As there are two schools located on, or just off, this road this could become quite dangerous at peak hours.

Local Facilities
Schools, Doctors and Dentists would have to be able to cope with approx 1,000+ extra people. As these facilities are all currently stretched, can they cope with this increase and are finances available for this extra demand.

Flooding/Water
Once housing is built any excess water will run onto properties in Cedar Drive or downhill along Ellough Road will be likely to pool at the junction with Hillside avenue and increase the chance of flooding to the properties there.
Paul Gurbutt

Section  Potential land for development 62 - Land east of Ellough Road, Worlingham

Comment ID  130

Comment  1. How do you protect the historic heart of Beccles from the increased traffic. All the developments are south of Worlingham and all the supermarkets are to the north (*) traffic blocking Beccles. The secondary schools locations (*) that cross Beccles traffic is inevitable. Larkfleet (area 82) gave no assurance of any solution to the traffic problem.

2. How do you plan for extra infrastructure? I have heard from Anglian Water that the sewage treatment works is already over stretched, without 100's more houses.
Jonathan Blankley

Section
Potential land for development 62 - Land east of Ellough Road, Worlingham

Comment ID
109

Comment
Development of this land removes another area of green space and the break between the existing residential area and the industrial estate. It will also add to the pressure of traffic going into town via Ellough Road and Ingate. It will also add to the number of trips to the High School, thus making an already busy route even worse. The access would need to be off Ellough Road which is fairly narrow, and not all walker or cyclist friendly. Or off College Lane, which leads on to Ellough Road.
Were it to be developed, then it would need to add to the existing community, by creating an area of green space between it and the existing properties, and including assets of benefit to the local community such as additional leisure facilities, and consideration of a pub/restaurant, something that Worlingham lacks.
Rachael Staniul

Section  
Potential land for development 62 - Land east of Ellough Road, Worlingham

Comment ID  
882

Comment  
Is a prime example of a rich wildlife habitat – birds, insects, butterflies and mammals. Hedgehogs are in serious decline due to habitat loss, and the removal of hedgerows. Covering this in concrete would be devastating for the wildlife, and would have a knock on effect for the whole area. Surely brownfield sites must be prioritised, rather than simply concreting over the countryside. We owe it to future generations to preserve such beautiful and diverse habitats, - not lose them forever.
Robert Sharman

Section  Potential land for development 62 - Land east of Ellough Road, Worlingham

Comment ID  102

Comment  Living next to the site I am obviously interested in what is proposed and welcome regular updates. My comments are made as a result of living here and my observations whilst doing so.

The site is bordered by industrial areas including a recycling facility, these produce noticeable noise and smell at times and can operate 24 hours. I believe that developing any closer to these industrial areas is not to be recommended as this would not be a pleasant environment to live in.

The development would increase the traffic in Beccles further which is already regularly gridlocked at peak times.

Employment opportunities are limited by geography and the development will need to attract non-locals and the retired, this will not necessarily increase the prosperity of the town and health services will struggle to cope with the influx.

Having lived in the immediate area since 1972 I've experienced many changes, Beccles thrives as it has balance in housing, jobs and services and this balance has evolved gradually, I believe that to significantly increase just one of these elements, housing, will have detrimental effect on the quality of life within the area.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust  James Meyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 62 - Land east of Ellough Road, Worlingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Sites 8; 9; 44; 60; 62; 81; 82 and 89 form a large block of land which is likely to be of some value, particularly for farmland species. Careful consideration should therefore be given to the allocation of these sites for residential development, in order to ensure that it does not result in an adverse impact on the wildlife value of the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Susan Doherty

Section  Potential land for development 62 - Land east of Ellough Road, Worlingham

Comment ID  932

Comment  Sites 44/60/62 Over 600 houses in this area is not sustainable, again no infrastructure, loss of habitat for wildlife, far too many houses
Worlingham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group John Coulson

Section Potential land for development 62 - Land east of Ellough Road, Worlingham

Comment ID 125

Comment As a resident of Worlingham my concerns are for the areas listed (82, 62, 60, 44).
Increase in traffic
Will local drainage be able to cope. A recent response to our Neighbourhood Plan group indicates that foul and surface water drainage is already virtually at its limit.
What will WDC do to improve facilities in Worlingham as we currently have no village hall, pub etc.
What will determine the number / rate of housebuilding in Worlingham?
Can you please differentiate between Worlingham and Beccles, they are not the same place!
Will the local plan consider a new doctors surgery in Worlingham.
What is WDC position with the Larkfleet housing proposal. When will you have establish what growth level you will be working with?
How will our neighbourhood plan be able to influence WDC planning?
When do we need to have our neighbourhood plan in place to be considered in WDC planning?
Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

andy Howlett

Section | Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID | 293

Comment | Suggest that this is planted as a woodland area to make wildlife habitation. The village of Blundeston will become Carlton Colville if further development is permitted. Just take a drive down The Street in Blundeston along the obstacle course and mish mash of parked cars and current overdevelopment. Too many cars in the village already. No where for them to park off road. Traffic generated by a development of this size would be significant. The village structure cannot support development of this scale. On the plan so far no account is taken of any future development of the former prison site and the impact this could have. Blundeston is a village – keep it that way. This is simply greed and over development. We strongly object.
Bruce Rayner

Section  Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID  395

Comment  Regarding the map of potential land for development in Blundeston
Site 63 - 242 homes
Generally:
1. The plan indicates that housing demand may exceed supply and that there may be a requirement for a further 8,000 homes before 2036. Before large areas of the locality are built upon, are the Council certain of the requirement? It would seem irresponsible to build numerous 'white elephants'. Is this not merely a function of the Government's policy to build a specified number of homes but without certainty of need in this area?
2. The plan indicates that there are already 3,141 new homes in the pipeline, plus a further 633 anticipated. That would seem to be enough for the present until precise requirements are known.
Specifically to Blundeston:
a) Most of the employment in the plan would appear to be within the area South of the river. It would therefore make sense to concentrate on housing in that area i.e. in the vicinity of the Carlton Colville areas.
b) Transportation in Blundeston is poor with bad road access, many of which are dangerous even with low traffic conditions. A number of the specified sites (164-165) are far better served for roads and also do not impinge upon the existing properties.
c) A number of the Blundeston sites do not benefit from obvious safe and easy access. For example, number 63 is served by a road which is on a bend and is dangerous enough at the best of times.
d) Surely it would be better to keep this area rural from a tourism point of view. This is an area used by local runners, cyclists, etc. and further traffic would damage that amenity for ever, together with attractions such as Somerleyton and Fritton, an idyllic serene area very much enjoyed by tourists.
e) I am not entirely sure of the numbers set against the sites. The densities do not seem to make sense. For example, site 164 is 18.7 ha and is allocated 270 homes. Presumably there are reasons for this. At 30 homes per ha (considered normal), nearly 500 homes could be allocated on this far more appropriate site. As a Chartered Surveyor, with experience in property development, your figures do not appear to be accurate.
f) Blundeston is a tiny village with no real services (no shop etc.) and only a
primary school. The nearest secondary school is Benjamin Britten, ideally placed for sites 164-165.
g) Blundeston is not served by a regular bus service at all (3 times per day, less so at weekends) so any new residents would be forced to use yet more cars. Surely an environmental issue. There are no allocated safe cycle routes, whereas the areas to the North and South of Lowestoft are well served with cycle routes already. If public transport were to be improved, this would create a hazard in itself because buses on the tiny country roads serving Blundeston are a major hazard.
h) Blundeston is primarily a village of older and mature properties. New homes next to other new homes in Carlton Colville would make far more sense, instead of 'blots' on the landscape.
i) By publishing this document, you seem to have added planning blight to nearly all of the homes surrounding Lowestoft for no apparent reason.
j) Building 456 new homes in Blundeston would almost double the population of the village (1,637): surely not desirable, sensible or necessary.
k) Currently essential services / supply (water / sewerage / gas, etc.) are limited. At certain times of the day, water pressure is already very low.
l) The risk of flooding through rainfall would increase in the village if soak up becomes diminished with the presence of a concrete jungle.
m) Broadband is slow within the village and mobile phone signals are significantly impaired.
n) There would be demolition costs associated with site no. 63.
o) The development planned for the prison site is already enough for the village to cope with.
p) Blundeston is inhabited by lots of wildlife - there are owls, newts, hedgehogs, etc. I've heard baby owls calling to their parents from our house. Some of these species are becoming rare. Why destroy these areas when there are alternatives?
q) My partner and I moved to Blundeston because we wanted to live in a quiet rural area and we wanted a view across a field. We are absolutely devastated to think that this fabulous area could be spoilt by the apparent unsubstantiated need for such housing. If it happens, we will be moving.
Conclusion
It makes far more sense to build on the sites identified at Carlton Colville. The proper infrastructure could be put in place on one area (roads, mains services, shops, schools, GP practice, etc.) It is South of Lowestoft which is where the jobs are supposed to be. Why spoil beautiful landscapes, upset huge numbers of the local population and potentially decrease tourism and enjoyment of the areas outlined?
Carl Wright

Section: Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID: 952

Comment:
I came by this information via my neighbour as you have not informed me directly which I find quite amazing!
That aside I then have to question what on earth the thoughts are around these proposals, as currently they make no sense apart from increasing the wealth of the local land owner. This proposal cannot possibly have been made with consideration to the village status of Blundeston, its community and its history.
The proposed building of the 242 house site adjacent our house will introduce a huge increase of noise from its construction to its end result, with circa 1000 additional people and 500 cars all entering and exiting the proposed "estate" spoiling the lovely countryside that I have worked so hard to be living near and so hard for in maintaining, the thought of the amount of houses here and around Blundeston sickens me.
We moved here 5 years ago to be in a rural village surrounded by fields and although I appreciate that there needs to be new development, I find this solution to be ludicrous beyond compare. The local school is already full, the parking along Church Road already needs a serious look at before someone is seriously hurt, the parking in general on the roads of Blundeston is getting worse and no improvement has been forthcoming, but yet you are considering bringing in a further 4000 people along with their visitors and cars, very thoughtless. The infrastructure and road network is not sufficient by any means to safely cope with such plans and should such plans go-ahead we will leave a suburban legacy for our children and with it we will see an increase in crime, pollution, noise, cars, people and accidents.
In conclusion, I am vehemently opposed to your plans, my house will dramatically drop in value, and very insulted that you never even bothered to contact me, I had to hear it from my neighbour!
I would appreciate the chance to be consulted on a proposal that will have such a dramatically negative impact on the life of me and my family and hope that the local population will be properly informed of how we can oppose such a damaging scheme to our village.
Elizabeth Fulwood

Section Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 675

Comment Following receipt of a copy of the proposed new housing sites in Blundeston, I write to express my concerns over 2 sites in particular, Site 63, suggested for 242 houses and Site 42 suggested for 127 houses. Whilst smaller developments of 5 or 10 houses can almost be built unnoticed, much larger developments such as those suggested for Sites 63 and 42 would, I feel, destroy the beauty, the peacefulness and charm of the village which are the very reasons I moved into Blundeston over 25 years ago. The open spaces and views I have enjoyed in the village for many years would be lost and traffic and noise would increase.

Whilst I understand that not all sites will be needed and not all the proposed number of houses on those sites will be built, I am concerned that should the larger sites go ahead, the Blundeston I know and love today will be lost.

I do not object to new houses being built in Blundeston but I do object to such large developments.
Gary Shilling

Section 
Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 
380

Comment 
As outlined in my local village news letter (Blundeston) I would like to register my rejection to any large scale building (sites 29, 42, 63 & 129), in my opinion the village neither has or has the ability to enable a construction on these scales. We have neither the roads to handle the increased traffic (roads not in a good state of repair or wide enough, concerns for children around the village as no road has a cycle lane or footpath), the school could not accommodate an increase, no local facilities and simply no need. It is nice to remain a village and not end up becoming part of oil ton broad as outlined village has done! I have no objection to small (under 10) development that allow the village to absorb the impact that it would have. I understand this is a biased view, but like everybody whom lives here, we picked it because it is a small village. This is mind with the development on the old prison site and other sites (that have been constructed and are just footings in the ground) the usual infill sites have been enough. The development on the prison will increase the traffic in and out of the village hugely as most households have two cars if not more, and that with children staying at home for longer traffic will increase without further building. T can already be seen throughout Lowestoft, Blundeston aside people are increasing parking on the road instead of using garages of changing front gardens to off road parking which should be implemented to remove cars parked on roads to increase road safety. Sorry didn't mean to turn into a rant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gary Shilling</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  
Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID  
1030

Comment  
Proximity to Church of St Mary grade I and Somerleyton Park Historic Park and Garden. Potential impact upon setting of High Grade Listed Building and the Park and its setting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>John Mitchell</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M and G Miller

Section  Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID  900

Comment  We feel very concerned about the possible future building plans for Blundeston, particular to us would be site 63 which we have no wish to see become another Carlton Colville together with all the other sites. Blundeston is a beautiful historic village which already struggles with school traffic, our estate becomes a glorified car park on school days my daughter has difficulty in leaving our house to collect children from other schools, so cannot imagine how Blundeston school could be enlarged. People in the village have trouble with flooding as the drains can't cope. The prison site will be developed in some way so we hope after that Blundeston will be left in peace.
Peter Carrier

Section  Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID  460

Comment  Holy unsuitable sites for such massive builds, there is inadequate infrastructure (sewage, utilities and roads) such a project would ruin the outlying area, in addition This would take away good agricultural land growing food, a consideration for lowering the imports and potential local economy issues with the EU.
Stephen Brown

Section

Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID

454

Comment

I was not informed of these plans by post unlike my neighbours, so I'm somewhat surprised that maybe you feel it not necessary to inform me? That aside I then have to question what on earth the thoughts are around these proposals as currently they make no sense apart from thinking there's a lot of very rich land owners wanting to make even more money without considering the village status of Blundeston and its history, that's the emotional side of my email over its now to the facts. The proposals, and with interest the 242 house site will introduce a huge increase of noise, from its construction to its end result with circa 1000 additional people and 500 cars all entering and exiting the proposed "estate" spoiling the lovely countryside that I have worked so hard for to be living near and so hard for in maintaining it, the thought of the amount of houses here and around Blundeston sickens me. I have lived in the parish now with my family for over 20 years and I know that there needs to be development but this is ludicrous beyond compare.
Alan Yardy

Section Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 441

Comment

* The site in question is of high quality, productive arable land and any development would represent a significant loss. New developments should be situated on low quality land.

* The frontage of the site is situated on the un-classified Flixton Road, a narrow road with a series of bends and junctions. This road is totally unsuitable for the volume of traffic resulting from the development envisaged or the traffic involved in the construction phase.

* The proposed development would present significant problems regarding capacity in the village school.
| NEIL CASE |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| **Section** | Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston |
| **Comment ID** | 313 |
| **Comment** | REDEVELOPMENT OF BLUNDESTON PRISON SITE MORE THAN FULFILLS ANY NEED FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT IN THE VILLAGE. THIS ALSO APPLIES TO SITES 49, 29, 42, 129, 20, & 27 THIS IS A SMALL VILLAGE WITH LIMITED INFRASTRUCTURE, & FACILITIES FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT SMALL OR LARGE. |
Tim caley

Section: Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID: 297

Comment: This is green belt land. Blundeston has a huge pending development site at the prison site. There is no infrastructure in the village to support the present expansion let alone more building. Blundeston has no shops, doctors surgery or dentist and has a school which is already oversubscribed. All local roads are small and dangerous with numerous blind bends and hidden entrances and exits. Further increases in traffic will increase deaths and or serious injuries. Roads are in an appalling state of repair and are constantly clogged with school traffic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Stuart Precious</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David Preston

Section: Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID: 590

Comment: I feel that this is too many extra houses as it will change the character of the village. I am also concerned that the infrastructure, particularly drainage, would be a problem as it seems to be under constant strain as it is.
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section                  Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID          965

Comment
• Sites not suitable for development:
  63 Land east of Flixton Road
  We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure.
Raymond Gaitero

Section Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID 610

Comment Hi, surely this is not a serious plan to build 242 houses on this site. I cannot see on this plan where the development of the former Blundeston prison is listed. Surely this has to be taken into consideration before any further planning is agreed in Blundeston.

The development of the Prison site will surely put pressure on an already overdeveloped Blundeston.

There are no shops, no bus service, no industry other than farming/building and I’m sure the Primary school will not be able to take anymore schoolchildren, let alone the infrastructure.

Looking at other plans submitted for Blundeston I cannot believe the farmers want to sell their land! surely we need good farmland to sustain our ever growing population.

I and many others in my village are totally against these developments.

Regards
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>simon bunting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Introduction
1.1 Waveney District Council is responsible for setting the amount of housing and employment land is required in Waveney in the future. They are in the early stages of preparing a new local plan which will determine the number and location of new housing and employment sites in the District for the period up to 2036.
1.2 Evolution Town Planning have been instructed by the Somerleyton Estate to make representations to this public consultation. This is an early stage in the process whereby the Council allocates sites for housing and employment development.
1.3 This report includes commentary on the Site Option 63 in Blundeston. Our responses to the consultation Questions have been submitted under separate cover on the District Council’s proforma and a copy is provided here in Appendix 1.
1.4 Evolution Town Planning (ETP) are experienced in promoting rural sites either through development plan representations or planning applications. We also have site assessment experience from working in Council planning departments. As a practice we have 30 years of combined professional experience in this type of work.
1.5 These representations include a potential housing site in in Blundeston. The site is east of Flixton Road and north of the primary school. The site is large and it is not necessarily the case that if selected for development the District Council would wish to see it developed in its entirety. We present the site in its entirety at this stage for the District Council's consideration.
1.6 This site has been assessed and we consider it to remain suitable, available, achievable and viable taking into account relevant policy requirements and obligations.
1.7 The identification of this site results from a village-wide walk over and assessment of the development potential. The plan in Appendix 2 identifies the site, its location in the village and its surroundings.
1.8 According to evidence in the Waveney Village Profiles and from our tour of the village Blundeston benefits from a number of local facilities and services which contribute to its sustainability.
1.9 The Somerleyton Estate is open to the tenure and mix of housing which
could be delivered on this site. Much depends on the final site selection and local needs but could include bungalows, affordable housing and smaller homes for first time buyers. These are all issues identified as important to the community in the 2005 Village Plan.

1.10 It remains unclear how the District Council will be responding to recent Government guidance on boosting housing supply and recognising the benefits of rural housing. Therefore the recognition of the village's sustainability credentials is something we will be pursuing through the local plan review.

1.11 In the meantime we invite the District Council to consider the information in this report, the merits of the site to enable the village of Blundeston it to 'play its role in delivering sustainable development'1 in Waveney.

2.0 Planning Policy

2.1 The Waveney Core Strategy dated 2009 was an early respondent to the 2004 Planning Act in respect of the adoption of the Local Development Framework in comparison to other Council's in Suffolk.

2.2 In the 2009 Waveney Core Strategy Blundeston was classified as a 'Larger Village' and with other villages was earmarked for accommodating 5% of the district's housing needs.

2.3 The Core Strategy anticipated that much of the housing growth in Blundeston would occur on brownfield sites and from our tour of the village we saw that the former garage site, the former Methodist Church and other small brownfield sites had already been developed.

2.4 The Core Strategy anticipated that some development may be needed on greenfield sites on the edge of the village. With many of the principle brownfield sites in the village now developed attention may turn towards the greenfield sites to deliver housing growth over this next plan period.

2.5 The Waveney Core Strategy predates the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and is becoming increasingly out of step with national planning policy imperatives and recent Government requirements for local plans to be in place by early 2017. For example the Framework requires local planning authorities "to boost significantly the supply of housing".

2.6 The PPG provides guidance on rural housing and states (our emphasis in bold):

Rural Housing How should local authorities support sustainable rural communities? Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306 It is important to recognise the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability, and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements. This is clearly set
out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in the core planning principles, the section on supporting a prosperous rural economy and the section on housing.

A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities.

Assessing housing need and allocating sites should be considered at a strategic level and through the Local Plan and/or neighbourhood plan process. However, all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.

The National Planning Policy Framework also recognises that different sustainable transport policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.

2.7 The Waveney New Local Plan is at an early stage and it is not yet clear how Waveney District Council will be responding to these national policy imperatives and how this will be reflected in revisions to the settlement hierarchy in the spatial strategy.

2.8 It is not known whether the District Council will refresh their settlement hierarchy and again direct a proportionate amount of housing to the 'larger villages' or whether they will abandon the 'blanket approach' of settlement boundaries and allow development where it can be shown to be sustainable and well related to the built form. Much will depend on the responses the Council receives to the Issues and Options consultation.

2.9 In terms of policy guidance on the site assessments below we have had regard to policies of the adopted Core Strategy (2009), the CIL Charging Schedule and the Development Management document (2011); specifically policies DM01 Physical Limits, DM16 Housing Density, DM17 Housing Type and Mix and DM18 Affordable Housing.

2.10 The Council acknowledges the need to review these policies as part of the new Local Plan as they were based on former national planning policy priorities and predate the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

2.11 These local policy documents are adopted and, as the Council acknowledges, form a useful baseline now and we have had regard to them in the same manner.

2.12 The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) seeks to deliver sustainable development. We consider that the assessment below
shows that the residential development of the site we have submitted will meet the social, environmental and economic tests for sustainable development.

3.0 The Village of Blundeston

Geography

3.1 Blundeston is located in the north of Waveney District and is 4 miles from the centre of Lowestoft. Blundeston is 2.5 miles from the village of Somerleyton with its Post Office and Rail Station both of which Blundeston does not have.

3.2 Blundeston has a population of 1637 people and 509 dwellings. The demographic displays an imbalanced gender distribution with 40% more male residents than female. The average age matches the average for Suffolk and the East of England.

Key Facilities

3.3 The Waveney District Council Village Profile (Appendix 3) for Blundeston lists the key facilities which contribute to the sustainability of the village.

3.4 The key facilities in Blundeston include a food shop, public house, meeting place and a primary school. There is also a church, football pitch, bowling green, tennis and netball court, millennium park, playground and post box.

3.5 The nearby villages of Somerleyton and Lound have additional key facilities accessible to Blundeston including a rail station, post office, food shop and a primary school, contributing to its sustainability.

4.0 Site Option 63 Land East of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Site Description and Development Potential

4.1 The site is located in the west of the village and is immediately adjacent to the primary school. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 2 along with the Council's completed Call for Sites proforma.

4.2 The site is 12ha in size and is well related to the built form of the village. It is important that the Parish Council and residents are clear that it is unlikely that the District Council would seek to allocate the entire site. Submitting the entire site at this early stage allows for future refinement depending on the District Council's needs for Blundeston.

4.3 While Policy DM16 indicates a density of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) is appropriate as set out above it is unlikely the whole 12ha would be developed. The density of development on this site will to a degree be dictated by the character of nearby development.

4.4 Existing local planning policy requires 35% of the dwellings which this site, or part of it, could deliver to be affordable. The lack of affordable housing was a significant issue expressed in the 2005 Village Plan.

4.5 The site is a regular square shape and is generally flat and with a slight
slope to the west to Flixton Road.

4.6 To the north of the site is Holly Gardens Nursery. To the west is agricultural land. To the east is agricultural land and beyond that residential properties fronting The Street. To the south of the site is the primary school and residential development fronting Church Road and in Dickens Court.

4.7 The site is approximately 7 minutes walking time via pavements to many of the village facilities.

4.8 The site has a significant frontage onto Flixton Road with good visibility in each direction and footpath access to Church Road and an existing access.

4.9 Visibility from the existing field entrance to the left extends 100m to the junction with the B1074. To the right visibility currently extends some 100m.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 This report promotes a site in Blundeston in response to the new Local Plan Issues and Options consultation.

5.2 Blundeston is a larger village in the Waveney settlement hierarchy and serves and in turn is served by a number of nearby villages that benefit from a range of facilities where development in one can support services and facilities in another.

5.3 There is a pressing need to deliver a significant boost in housing supply nationally and Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that rural areas can play their part.

5.4 We have reviewed national and local planning policy and guidance and have visited the site and toured the area. We have submitted this site because it meets the consultation threshold and the criteria set out in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment consultation methodology (Oct 2015).

5.5 Our site assessment shows that the site remains suitable, available and achievable and that an allocation for development would meet the economic, social and environmental principle of sustainable development in Waveney.

5.6 The site has the ability to provide for a mix of housing types to meet the needs set out in the Waveney Housing Market Assessment and evidenced local need.

Site Map and Blundeston Village Profile attached.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>1206</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The large sites around Blundeston (63, 42, 129) are not currently desirable as there are limited amenities and services within reasonable distance to promote sustainable travel patterns and some of the road network might not be of sufficient standard or capacity. If this scale of development, including growth beyond the village and the proposed redevelopment of the prison, is to be brought forward, a comprehensive review of transport issues will need to be undertaken which may include opportunities for further enhancement of transport infrastructure and services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terry Gooding

Section  
Potential land for development 63 - Land east of Flixton Road, Blundeston

Comment ID  346

Comment  
Blundeston cannot support a development of this size, there simply isn’t the infrastructure to justify it. Destruction of greenfield sites, over subscription of essential services such as schools and doctors, the fact that roads will become busier and more dangerous as a result. Increased risks of flooding due to concrete coverage. As a wider concern I do not see plans for new hospitals, fire stations, police stations, doctors, school or public transport. Why is the redevelopment of the prison site not included here which in itself will contain at least 100 houses - will this offset your need to build all over Blundeston & ruin yet another beautiful village. People live here to escape the sprawl not live on a housing estate. I appreciate that housing is required but not on this scale and any planning application of this nature will be opposed by all who live there.
Potential land for development 64 - Land east of Woodfield Close, Willingham

Sotterley Estate Tom Barne
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section Potential land for development 64 - Land east of Woodfield Close, Willingham

Comment ID 1190

Comment Site Description and Development Potential
8.1 Site Option 64 is located east of Woodfield Close in Willingham. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 7.
8.2 The site is 0.58ha in size and is well related to the built form of the village. It is rectangular in shape and has a flat topography.
8.3 The site is in agricultural use and has recently been used as a horse’s paddock.
8.4 According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 17 dwellings on this part of the site.
8.5 More appropriately and reflecting the density of surrounding development, Woodfield Close in particular, this site could provide for around 10 dwellings (including 3 affordable homes) arranged in a manner sympathetic to the site and its location. Development would probably take a similarly linear form to Woodfield Close.
8.6 The site benefits from two existing vehicular access; one via Woodfield Close and a field entrance off Sotterley Road. The field access could be repositioned onto the frontage with Sotterley Road where it would have good visibility onto London Road.
8.7 The site is bounded to the north and west by residential development, to the south by agricultural land and to the east by plantation woodland.

Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal
8.8 We agree with the conclusion of the Site Sustainability Assessment (SSA) for this site that retention of trees, hedgerow and the pond would mitigate harm to biodiversity.
8.9 Point 11 in the SSA states that development would lead to the loss of agricultural land. The site has been out of active agricultural use for at least a couple of decades and is too small and enclosed for modern agricultural
equipment. The score against this criteria can be increased from – to 0 (neutral) to reflect circumstances.
Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Andrew Payne

Section
Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID
420

Comment
I am very disappointed that this site has come up for consideration. It forms, in my opinion, a sensible strategic gap between the market town of Halesworth and the village of Holton and should not be built on. The two should, in my opinion, be kept separate, not least because there are several brownfield sites available for development that MUST take precedence over greenfield site development. Backing onto the area, which when I moved here was used as farmland but has been lying fallow for many years (but very occasionally mowed) I observe other issues. First, the area has a number of natural springs (at least two to my knowledge), and the meadow acts as a sponge to stop excessive run-off of water through the houses and gardens on Holton Road. Second, if potentially 150 new homes were to be built on the area, all the traffic associated with the development (while building and when complete) would have to use the single entrance/egress of Hill Farm Road; that is far too much traffic for a small estate. Third, it is also populated and used as a hunting ground by a family of barn owls (almost every year that I have been living here, this family of owls has been evident. Moreover, muntjac and other slightly larger deer (plus regular smaller fauna such as hedgehogs and rabbits) are regularly seen in the field over my back fence (the main field has regrettably been closed to the public for more than a year), and my own pond that abuts it has newts living in it quite contentedly. In summary, I strongly oppose developing Area 65 because of its strategic greenbelt nature between two towns, access/egress problems, serious drainage concerns, and its environmental (mainly fauna) importance. Finally, I happen to know that Hopkins Homes was granted by the owner first refusal for site development many years ago (the owner of the land told me so). While that company does seem to build quality homes, their history of abiding by planning regulations (is very poor and the level of public trust associated with their developments is nil.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Campbell</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DC Patrick Newsagents DC Patrick**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>When are they going to build there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 525

Comment This land is not suitable for residential development for the following reasons:-
* The land is remote from the town centre and residential development would exacerbate car journeys.
* This land forms a major part of the Strategic Gap (Policy DM 28 Adopted January 2011) and Open Breaks to prevent coalescence of Halesworth and Holton and maintain the open character of the high land and fields and ancient hedgerows that separate the two settlements.
* This land forms an important backdrop to the peaceful setting and high landscape quality of the Town Cemetery.
* There does not appear to be any feasible access to the land.
* Development on the scale suggested would impose an intolerable burden of additional traffic on the Holton Road.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section: Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID: 1197

Comment: The sites further north 106,140,141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town. There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Agency</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints: Source Protection Zone 2 *Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment). <a href="http://apps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/37833.aspx">http://apps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/37833.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G H Thomas

Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 15

Comment

I hear so often the need for more building of houses to allow people to afford to live in a particular area. Halesworth and Holton could do with more but it must be very carefully considered so as not to create a huge problem of literal flooding and the social and economic fallout without considerable expansion of doctors/health facilities, road networks, bus services, train services. We live in an age whereby we are all told to walk or cycle more but the facilities for these are very poor if there is to be an increase in road traffic on existing highways.

The proposed land for development on site 65 has the potential to undermine any property along the boundary due to the potential for flooding. The land so far this year April 2016 has not dried out. It has been wet for at least 5 months now and has standing water in many places despite there being more than adequate drainage and ditches being re-instated. If site 65 is developed it will flood, no matter what is carried out by the developers to alleviate the problem. The land has not been designed by nature to take such vast amounts of concrete. The land acts as a sponge which can not work with an increase in hard surfaces. The run off from road and pavement areas as well as the properties themselves has to go somewhere which will be to the neighbouring properties further down hill along Holton Road. The land adjacent to the site which is not built on will become a continuous shallow lake due to the water trying to find an area to settle.

This I am sure is of no consequence to those wanting the land developed so long as they can give the appearance of flood management as laid down by local government. This is not enough and has the potential to create future problems for the properties being able to get insurance and safeguard homes. Will WDC and Suffolk county council give an assurance of paying out substantial compensation if they give the go ahead for any substantial development.
Gary Brown

Section  Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID  493

Comment  The area at present already appears to be at full stretch with doctors appointments at an average of three weeks, schools at bursting point and sewage and traffic appearing unable to cope with present occupants. The bottom line is, the town is too small for this amount of properties.
Graham Johnson

Section  
Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID  
246

Comment  
Development of this site would be totally wrong on several counts:
1) This open space of grassland exists to separate Halesworth from Holton. If developed it would cause the village of Holton to effectively merge with Halesworth, thus losing their individual identity.
2) The existing sewage system which travels under Holton road and across the Blythe Valley to the sewage farm is already unfit for purpose. During periods of heavy rain in winter, the inspection covers in the valley are forced off allowing raw sewage to spew out onto the Millenium Green cycle/footpath on one side of the railway line and to flow into the River Blyth from another cover on the other side of the rail line. Severe winter storms seem to be becoming more frequent and the addition of 150 extra homes would simply overwhelm the system.
3) Hill Farm road is quite unsuitable for all the extra traffic that would result from development- It is already difficult on occasion to pull out of The Paddocks, as the view of traffic coming down Hill Farm Road is obscured by a 1.8 metre high garden wall , and speeding vehicles appear into view as you pull across.
4) Local Halesworth public services are already inadequate -at present it takes 3 weeks to get an appointment with your GP a totally unacceptable situation. There is a national shortage of GPs this is not a situation that any developer could satisfactorily solve.

Suggested Solution:
Pass a Bye Law forcing all second home owners in Waveney to have their properties occupied for at least 46 weeks a year. Why build on Greenfield Sites when thousands of second homes stand empty for the majority of the year. An absolute disgrace!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 65 is in the strategic gap between Holton and Halesworth. This gap is important to both settlements. It is necessary to preserve the character of each. There are two natural springs that drain into the main field. As with other proposed sites, there is only one road serving the residents. The proposal for the addition of 150 houses requires considerable improvements to the infrastructure of the area and the town. School places, medical facilities and drainage and sewage problems. The location of this site, with so much open land behind, has allowed owls and deer to use this area. Development would damage greatly damage this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England Debbie Mack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Proximity to Town Farmhouse, grade II listed building to north and Hill Farmhouse grade II listed to south. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hopkins Homes Christopher Smith

Section  Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID  455

Comment  Following the previous Representations made to the 'Call for Sites' Consultation in January 2016, Hopkins Homes would re-affirm the suitability of Site 65 to provide for sustainable housing development, incorporating significant new areas of strategic public open space, together with a potential extension to the existing Cemetery, as detailed upon the previously submitted Feasibility Layout Plan.

The site lies in a highly sustainable location, adjacent to areas of existing modern housing and within walking distance to the town centre and railway station.

As detailed upon the previous Layout Plan, the site has the potential to accommodate up to 150 dwellings within the south-western parcels, together with significant areas of new dedicated strategic open space to the north and east, thereby ensuring that the desired physical separation between Halesworth and Holton is maintained.

Feasibility sketch and site boundary map attached.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>James Chambers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**   | No1 why are you considering building on green site land.  
No2 where are approximately 200 hundred cars going to gain access to this site.  
No3 from my past experience two of the fields that run along side Holton Road flood. |
Jim Phillips

Section Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 57

Comment We object strongly to the proposed building development for the following reasons. When we purchased our property on Holton Road the views over the open land from our back garden was a particular attraction and we would hate to lose it. The supporting infrastructure, i.e. doctors, dentists and hospitals, barely copes with the present demand. Any additional housing in this local area will increase appointment waiting times far beyond acceptable limits. When we first moved to Halesworth we had to register at a dental practice in Southwold. The increased traffic on Holton Road resulting from additional housing will increase vehicle numbers using the Holton Road/Hill Farm Road junction by at least 150. Present traffic calming measures are ineffective/non-existent. We have already had our front garden wall replaced after being struck by a speeding vehicle! Flooding has already occurred at junction on Holton Road with Hill Farm Road when Hill Farm Road development was underway. We are also concerned about flooding in our rear garden resulting from water run-off from the rising land north of Holton Road due to green fields being replaced with hard surfaces. Halesworth will lose its identity as an individual market town due to the new housing extending from Halesworth to Holton across existing open spaces. Also due to the rise in the land extending northwards from Holton Road would result in considerable loss of privacy at present enjoyed by properties along Holton Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Joyce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lavery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jose De Oliveira

Section: Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID: 438

Comment:
Dear Sir/Madam

We are gravely concerned about plans to build on the fields north and east of Hill Farm Road. We know of at least two natural springs in the area, and the fields serve as a natural way to soak up excess water; so any building on that land would seriously affect this functionality and would therefore potentially have a detrimental effect on homes in and around the area. We are also concerned about building on greenfield sites such as this one, which we have seen supports wildlife (deer, small mammals, barn owls, etc.), when there are other brownfield sites within the Halesworth area that would be suitable for development and should take precedence. Area 65 also forms a buffer zone between Halesworth and Holton, and should therefore be kept in its current state to maintain the integrity of each of these areas. Finally, traffic is a serious concern, should building take place, given the single access point via Hill Farm road to the proposed area. We therefore are deeply concerned and strongly oppose the development of Area 65.

Kind Regards
Dr J.A.A. De Oliveira and Ms E.T. Wise
Karen JohnsonLaird

Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 67

Comment

I believe that this area is not suitable for further redevelopment. The access roads are totally unsuitable for all the lorries that will need to access the site. This will cause absolute misery for all the houses surrounding the site and completely change the feel and atmosphere for those living near and next to the new housing. Not to mention all the years of noise and disruption.

I moved to this area 6 months ago and chose the Paddocks because of its quiet location and for it being on the outskirts of the town. My house would become part of a large housing estate which is what I wanted to avoid when I chose my final move for my retirement. The proposal to build 150 houses here is totally unacceptable - it will join up Halesworth up with Holton and put extreme pressure on the approach road to the Town Centre.

All this extra housing will put additional pressure on all the local services - Doctors Surgery, Schools, Car Parks etc. Our quiet market town will become another Beccles which would be a travesty.

Looking at the Growth Scenarios, Halesworth is getting a raw deal on all options which is very unfair and should be looked at again.

I cannot believe that this amount of extra housing is being considered for the town.
Lesley Kingham

Section Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 548

Comment FLOODING
Our major concern is one of flooding. Area 65 is already very wet in large parts during the year. Currently rainwater drains through the fields seeping into gardens and the land just about manages to absorb it making some gardens soggy in the process. If the land is built on excess rainwater would have nowhere to go, therefore simply flowing off the roofs and roads, flowing downhill flooding the houses in Holton Road on its way to the river.

When the houses around Hill Farm Road were built this is exactly what happened and a house on Holton Road opposite the turning to Hill Farm Road needed a storm drain installed in front of it because it had been flooded due to the new building works.

Indeed, when the Houses around Hill Farm Road were built the foundations needed to be very deep because the ground here is so wet.

NATURE
Area 65 is home to three protected species, namely; Sky Larks, Turtle Doves and Tortoiseshell butterflies.

LACK OF FACILITIES
We have already suffered the loss of the Middle school and Patrick Stead Hospital is soon to close. Do we have enough facilities to cope with another 150 families?

Building in this area would seriously increase noise and traffic, Holton Road has become very busy over the last three or four years and already suffers badly from speeding traffic, posing danger to both pedestrians (particularly because the paths are so narrow) and other road users. Only last year a car driving too quickly mounted the pavement and crashed into a wall, luckily no one was hurt. This would only get much worse with another 150 homes filtering onto this road.
Linda Gray

Section: Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID: 46

Comment: This land is particularly high and if built in would overshadow all the properties surrounding it. There would also be a blot across the whole of Halesorts as any development would be visible from almost everywhere.
Louis Baum

Section  
Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID  
266

Comment  
[Saved in Chapel House as Objections to Waveney Development Plan 01 06 16]
Having only by chance come across the Waveney District Council's information re a consultation process for new developments between Halesworth and Holton, it is most surprising to us that this information was not circulated in Loam Pit Lane, which is surrounded by potential development plots, especially in the upper, northern end. This failure of consultation should on its own invalidate any proposals WDC might consider for development of this land for housing.
Further, considering WDC's own intentions to keep "strategic gaps" and "prevent coalescence and retain separate identities between Halesworth and Holton", and the assertion that "developments will not be permitted where it would prejudice the aims of maintaining the open character of strategic gaps and open breaks as identified on the proposal map", these locations, in particular 65, seem to be explicitly ruled out for further development. Why, therefore, are they up for discussion?
Even if this were not the case, problems of access and provision of services to these locations make them less desirable areas for development by comparison with other open spaces in the area northwest of Halesworth.
For these reasons we believe that WDC and Halesworth Town Council should explicitly rule out these locations as sites for future housing development.
Liz Calder and Louis Baum
Chapel House
Loam Pit Lane
Halesworth
IP19 8EZ
Louise Goddard

Section: Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID: 317

Comment: I feel that it not justified in putting houses where there is a cemetery I know that putting them thete will cause alot of upset to alot of people especially those who have loved ones at the cemetery.
M Whiting

Section
Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID
920

Comment
Run off water would go immediately to the rear of Holton Road creating more flooding which would ultimately affect the 'Millennium Green'. This area is supposedly for the enjoyment of Halesworth residents but would be seriously compromised. There are now no secondary school facilities here which presents costly transportation of all pupils over eleven years of age some nine plus miles to Bungay.

I have had to wait up to four weeks to see my doctor – how long will I wait with up to another six hundred people on the surgery list.

What happens to the wildlife which this area supports such as barn owls, green woodpeckers muntjack deer and I am given to understand there are great crested newts in the pond at the top of the field.
marcia walker

Section Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 303

Comment The views, natural habitat and space behind our house was one of the main reasons my husband and two young children moved in to this house seven years ago. We feel strongly that building such a large quantity of houses in this area would have a negative effect on our personal lives and on the environment. Our youngest child is already worried that if they build houses we might have to move.

In terms of the natural environment, we have some serious concerns should this ambitious building project go ahead:
- We feel that the following animals, seen regularly in this area, would be under threat should their natural habitat be taken away: Hedgehogs, Skylarks, Barn owls, Deer, Foxes, Turtle doves, Tortoiseshell butterflies, Sparrow hawk, Woodpeckers and Bats.
- The land is used daily for dog walking and walking and is an opportunity for people, especially children to engage with nature.
- During winter the ground holds a good amount of water that is able to soak away, we are concerned that if this land is built on we may have excessive water entering our property and flooding could carry on beyond to the houses on the other side of Holton Road.
- 150 houses seems to be an excessive number that may be too high for local services and infrastructure to support.
- This site is surrounded by many houses on two sides that will all be affected negatively by noise and traffic pollution, flooding, property value.
Mark Bird

Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 52

Comment

I am writing to lodge my objection to the proposal of the land north and east of Hill farm road Halesworth to be considered for development, my objections are as follows, firstly I believe that the proposed area is a green belt area and separates Halesworth from Holton and I think this should remain so. Secondly the fields are constantly water logged during the autumn and winter months and this will only become worse and cause flooding to the properties along the Holton road if it is developed and the water has nowhere to run off to.

The Hill farm road estate could not cope with extra traffic during construction so the increase in traffic once the development was fully occupied it would be impossible to cope with the volume of traffic from 150 houses.

Having lived adjacent to the fields for the past 25 years I have been privileged to witness an abundance of wildlife living and feeding from the area, including barn owls and brown owls, any development would destroy this habitat.

There are other more favourable sites within the Halesworth area that should be considered for development that are not on green belt land, however although I am in favour of seeing the town develop and progress I feel that Halesworth is desperately short of a supporting infrastructure, this includes lack of sufficient schools to support additional children, a Drs surgery that is extremely busy and getting an appointment is difficult, and I am sure that the water works and sewerage plant would be in need of expansion.

Halesworth is a countryside town so expansion should be considered with caution and include development of the town centre and shopping area, other amenities should include upgrading sports areas and leisure facilities.
| **Martin Briggs** |
| --- | --- |
| **Section** | Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth |
| **Comment ID** | 82 |
| **Comment** | This land is breeding habitat for the skylark, which is endangered and fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. I am therefore totally opposed to this application for environmental and moral reasons. |
Martin Briggs

Section  
Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID  
261

Comment  
This development would destroy the breeding habit of protected species; turn Hill Farm Road into a noisy and potentially dangerous rat run; interfere with drainage and water run-off in a way which, despite umpteen surveys and studies, cannot be safely predicted; erode the independence of Holton as a community; and make Halesworth itself a more anonymous and, perhaps, a slightly less desirable place to live. Despite continual parrottings from Westminster of determination to build so many hundreds of thousands of new homes within such and such a time, I cannot be convinced that there is a demand in Halesworth for this gratuitous development. I assume the proposal is based not on social need but on developers' desire to turn every available square inch of green space into commercial profit. If Waveney District Council actually care about the quality of life of those whom they purport to serve, and about the natural environment and habitats within their jurisdiction, they will throw out this proposal for good. If they should approve it, however, I trust that they will not, in the next breath, bemoan the public's lack of engagement in politics or its lack of faith in politicians.
Martin Drew

Section  
Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID  
243

Comment  
Objection to planning application, poor drainage and springs, local wildlife such as barn owls, deer, woodpeckers etc. Inadequate access to the site.
Martin Saunders

Section Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 89

Comment There are many reasons for significant concern regarding the proposed use of this land for development. The most significant issue would be the removal/erosion of the strategic gap that currently exists between Halesworth and Holton. Any "filling in" with development of this gap would eliminate any individual character these areas.

In addition to the concern cited above the following must be addressed as they are genuine reasons why this development must be rejected:

* Halesworth’s infrastructure cannot support any additional housing without a significant improvement.
* One one supermarket (with the car park always full),
* No sports facilities in the town,
* One Doctor’s surgery which is already at full capacity
* One Primary School
* Limited local employment opportunities
* The area discussed in this submission (No 65) is regularly subject to retaining significant levels of ground water close to the surface/minor local flooding and would require significant expensive ground works to properly address
* The area discussed in this submission (No 65) has a significant amount of wildlife – badges, heron, deer, woodpeckers, foxes and a barn owl as well as a thriving pond in the centre of the plot. All will be adversely impacted by this proposal
* Development of this site will also result in existing dwellings being overlooked and privacy impacted

In summary, the justification for development if this site and others identified in the consultation must be very carefully considered. If, as a local planning authority you consider there is a genuine requirement for development of currently unused land in the Halesworth area, I feel strongly that area No 65 has a number of significant reasons why the proposal for development must not be supported.
Mick Highnam

Section Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 184

Comment My concerns are as follows.
150 homes would change the character of the area and neighbourhood.
Concerns regards highway safety.
Holton village and Halesworth would become one area.
Impact on the environment.
As there would be an impact on the health and education service would the developer be expected to contribute towards providing more services?
Would any of this build be on green belt land?
Noise and disturbance once the development was completed.
The roads in the area are not designed for large building construction vehicle.
Jane Saunders

Section  Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID  108

Comment  The proposed development will be out of scale with the existing housing. It would 'erode' the strategic gap between Holton and Halesworth and have a big impact on wildlife in the area (foxes, badgers, barn owl, heron, deer, green woodpeckers and butterflies to name some).

There would be more traffic on an inadequate road system and a loss of 'rural character' to the area. Any new housing would overlook existing properties and the construction would cause major inconvenience. Housing would also result in the loss of cemetery land and cause disturbance to the existing burial ground. There is also a major flood risk. The fields are saturated all year round and major drainage works would need to be undertaken to address this problem on a grand scale. Housing on the other side of Holton Road leads down onto marshland which also floods regularly. Any new housing would need to be constructed with this in mind (flood protection = more cost) and may risk being unable to be insured.
Lorraine Thomas

Section Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 61

Comment When there was a consultation about possible development of this site many issues were raised against such a development. The land around this site floods and there is standing water for most of the Winter and for many Summer months when we have a period of consistent rain. This has since worsened because our climate is changing. Our Winter and our Summers are wetter and the forecast is that this will be a feature rather than an anomaly. I was under the impression that the Council was going to use the land (if suitable) for the necessary expansion of the cemetery? Hill Farm Toad is not suitable for more traffic and the entry and exit to the road from Holton Road would be dangerous. Road not Toad sorry. I am partially sighted! There should be a strategic gap between Halesworth and Holton. Tourists are so important to our area. The fact we are not over developed is a large appeal. The schools and the Cutlers Hill Surgery are over stretched now. There are many elderly who need resources and there is a large pre-school population in the area. Holton Rd is often difficult to travel on. Parking by the bridge etc. There is a need for sustainable, affordable housing but the land itself is unsuitable and its position is also unsuitable. Please keep me informed of any "developments" please. I only contacted you because I received an anonymous letter outlining this issue again. If anyone would like to come out and survey the land from my property they are welcome. It is dry at the moment but if it rains for a sustained period it will flood and/or have standing water. I have to deal with this I accept this is my personal responsibility but I would not be able to manage a worse situation because of building. Thank you for reading this. Please contact me if I am able to provide you with more information. Yours faithfully Mrs LS Thomas
Paul Cope

Section  Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID  152

Comment  Other sites - 65, 161, 153 etc would build within Halesworth.
Peter Sanderson

Section

Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID

30

Comment

I object to the development of this land for the following reasons:

1. A stretch of land should be kept between the 2 separate settlements of Halesworth and Holton. Otherwise these 2 settlements would merge in to one, losing their very distinct identities.

2. The only access to the site is via a small opening from Hill farm Road.

3. It is an area rich in wildlife: deer, barn owls, newts in the pond, green woodpeckers etc. It would be scandalous to take this natural habitat.

4. The ground is often waterlogged in parts of the fields.......especially where there is a transition from sand to clay.

5. Holton Road would provide the main route to the site. This is already very busy with the majority of the cars exceeding the 30mph limit.

6. A public footpath passes through the north of the area............this should not be lost.

Please see attached photos in support of objections to including Halesworth Area 65 in the planning strategy. These are an attachment to Comment ID 30.

This is how the fields look after prolonged heavy rain.
Sarah Tallis

Section Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 418

Comment Living in Holton Road, below the site apparently being considered for the development of 150 houses, I find it difficult to believe that there would be adequate access to this land via Hill Farm Road. Also there is enough water being drained off the field behind Holton Road, without a further development. Furthermore, there is a barn owl regularly patrolling these fields and also skylarks nesting here each spring. Halesworth is always being admired as a town with green, enviable green spaces why spoil it. I can appreciate that in years to come the land might be used as an extension to the cemetery. My neighbour, Mr Les Tennet, who lives at No.19 but is not on line, wants to join me in registering his opposition to this proposed development.
Sylvia Briggs

Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 616

Comment

I live in Hill Farm Road and am extremely concerned about the proposal to build 150 houses on adjoining fields (Area 65).

Inadequate road access

The site is only accessible via Hill Farm Road which is inadequate for the increase in traffic that would result from the building of 150 new houses. This development would put a huge strain on Hill Farm Road as well as Holton Road and the local infrastructure. Many of the new homes would have more than one car which would further exacerbate the traffic problem.

Green Field Land

The site is green field land outside the built up area; construction of 150 houses would not be consistent with the Core Strategy which recommends development only on brown field sites.

Wildlife Habitat

Skylarks, a "Red List" bird of high conservation concern and fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, nest in these fields, which the land owner seems fortunately to have left alone for some years. Naturalists place high value on such habitats where rough grassland and bramble blend into mature gardens of existing houses. Such places are rich in insects, birds and reptiles. We should be encouraging these sites, not destroying them.

Open space landscaping among residential housing, which would no doubt be promised by developers, would only be of interest to residents' domestic cats and those needing to walk their dogs. All very pleasant but of no use to wildlife which would inevitably be driven away for good.

Water Run Off

The fields are often wet and boggy and run off has been known to cause problems to the gardens along Holton Road. Climate change experts predict wetter winters and more extreme rainfall. Development of roads and buildings on these fields would increase the risk of flooding, and there is no reason to take such a risk.

Holton

Holton is a village separate from Halesworth. If this proposed development went ahead, it would lose its identity and simply become part of Halesworth town.
The rural landscape between Halesworth and Holton is worth preserving. For the above reasons I object to this proposed development on Site No. 65.
Richard chambers

Section Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 218

Comment We feel that it would be a great shame to lose this large area green belt land included in this proposal, the impact on the local wildlife would be devastating. Also it would fully join Holton to Halesworth which would be detrimental to the identity of Holton as a separate village.
Sonia Southgate

Section: Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID: 31

Comment: I strongly oppose the proposed development of the site detailed above. For the following reasons the development would be detrimental:
- Lack of appropriate/safe access to the proposed site
- Poor existing drainage that would not cope with additional use
- Regular sightings of wildlife in this habitat that is potentially to be developed including Barn Owl and Muntjacks. These species are already endangered in our area.
- This site is the only green belt between Halesworth and Holton.
- I am sure that this site could be put to better use, a solar farm for example or used for arable farming. There are other more appropriate sites in the Halesworth area that will not be of detriment to others if developed.
Susan Herrmann

Section Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 553

Comment The land to the north and east of Hill Farm Road forms a break between Halesworth and Holton any development here will link them together meaning there is no demarcation line between town and village. Not sure where the access will be but Hill Farm Road is already congested with cars parked on the roadway especially where it starts to narrow and feel that it would not be able to take the volume of traffic extra housing would create, plus children walking to the play area at the top of Hill Farm Road will be at risk with increase in traffic. I therefore feel that this area is not suitable for further housing. Also where will the extra surface water go as houses in the low on Holton Road tend to flood.
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 65 as stated in the WDC Green Strategy, the strategic gap between Halesworth and Holton is important for the character of both communities and should be protected. However the north western section of this site could have limited development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section | Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID | 326

Comment | My partner and I would like to object to any future development on site 65 inclusive of the latest proposal for the construction of 150 new dwellings. We reside at number 25 Holton road and back onto the said fields. We live approx 100 yards from the village of Holton and find the idea of filling the strategic gap separating Halesworth and Holton to be a great concern. Holton will lose its identity as a separate settlement and just become a borough of Halesworth which we believe to be fundamentally wrong. Further to this the main highway of Holton road would not comfortably support the potential increase of traffic. Also with us backing onto the fields we are aware of the abundance of wildlife that would be undoubtedly compromised by such a development, barn and tawny owls nest on the site yearly, with foxes visiting our garden on a regular basis, wild orchids can also be found growing. We first chose to live in the community of Halesworth because of its rural location, we believe this will be compromised with the plans set out. Our last concern regards the lack of infrastructure in the town. Halesworth has no sports facilities, no hospital, no secondary/high school and has just lost the Norfolk and Suffolk skill centre. We believe the council should invest their time and energy in resolving these issues before trying to increase the population of Halesworth. I hope you take on board our points of view and not just conform to government building quotas.
Tony Langford

Section: Potential land for development 65 - Land north and east of Hill Farm Road, Halesworth

Comment ID: 35

Comment: This space provides an important strategic gap between Holton and Halesworth and as there are many better sites for development in the area, this one should not progress. Apart from the strategic gap it provides, any development would worsen flooding through run-off on both sides of Holton road and increase the risk of sewage pollution.
Potential land for development 66 - Land north of 1-4 East View, St James Road, All Saints and St Nicholas South Elmham

Historic England Debbie Mack

Section

Potential land for development 66 - Land north of 1-4 East View, St James Road, All Saints and St Nicholas South Elmham

Comment ID

1032

Comment

Whaley’s grade II* listed building to west, The Elms, also grade II* west and a number of grade II listed buildings including The Willows and Barn to the north, and All Saints cottage to the south and Moat Farmhouse to the east. Potential impact upon high grade and other listed buildings.
Potential land for development 67 - Land north of Chapel Road, Wrentham

Benacre Estates Company Edward Vere Nicoll
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section Potential land for development 67 - Land north of Chapel Road, Wrentham

Comment ID 818

Comment Land north of Chapel Road was submitted to the Council’s Call for Sites in October 2015.
The site extends to approximately 1.02 hectares and could accommodate in the region of 30 dwellings (based on 30 dwellings per hectare). The site is within the sole ownership of our client and is considered suitable, available and deliverable in the next 1-5 years.
Development of the site would represent a logical extension to the village along Chapel Road. It is enclosed by residential development to the south and east, and the western boundary is formed by a dense tree belt. The land to the north of the site is also within our client's ownership and available for the development, should the Council consider this appropriate.
The site is not subject to any landscape constraints (as identified on the adopted Proposals Map, 2012) nor is it in an area of flood risk (as identified on the Environment Agency Flood Maps). It is anticipated access will be taken from Chapel Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Historic England Debbie Mack</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Wrentham Parish Council Frances Bullard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 67 - Land north of Chapel Road, Wrentham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>As a Parish Council we would ask that previous concerns raised regarding density, infrastructure, recreational space, increased traffic and parking are taken into consideration should a planning application be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 68 - Land North of Charters Piece, Willingham

Caroline Ellis

Section | Potential land for development 68 - Land North of Charters Piece, Willingham

Comment ID | 541

Comment | I strongly oppose the development of this site for housing. Aside from the fact that it will destroy the enjoyment of my house and garden, there is no direct access road to this site so any construction traffic will pass very close to my property. It is my opinion that this, along with ongoing building works so close to my home would likely result in structural damage to my Grade II listed property.

Also, this land is used as a hunting ground by a pair or barn owls; it is likely that the destruction or development of this habitat would have a detrimental effect on the chances of their successful raising of young and, ultimately, their survival.

Development of this, and indeed the other green field sites in the village, would have an adverse effect on the overall character and feel of the village. There are no amenities here in the village (unless you count the pub, fabulous though it is) and transport links are poor. I would also raise the issue of the nearby sewage treatment plant and the suitability of placing residential properties so close to an odorous and potentially dangerous installation. It is not clear if this plant has the capacity to manage the output of a large number of new residences in the village.

There is a site, previously housing some static caravans, to the rear of the Shadingfield Fox public house, that could, however, but a suitable site for a small number of new residential houses or flats.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 68 - Land North of Charters Piece, Willingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to Fox Farmhouse grade II listed building to north. Potential impact upon setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John B Pettifer

Section  
Potential land for development 68 - Land North of Charters Piece, Willingham

Comment ID  
644

Comment  
My comments relate to both Site 68 and 134 of the Planning Proposals.
Site 68
Item 1: This is a land locked site.
Item 2: This piece of land is heavily water logged during the winter period, or following heavy rain.
Item 3: It will have negative effect on the rural character of the village.
Item 4: There is very limited public transport from this area.
Item 5: There are little or no amenities within the Village of Willingham St Mary.
Item 6: Any proposed construction is likely to effect the habitat of existing Barn Owls within the area.
Item 7: The nearest hospital and school are in Beccles some 3/4 miles away from the proposed site.
Site 123
Item 1: If housing development is required, this may prove to be a better site in respect of road access and general accessibility.
Item 2: A better proposal may well be residential development north side of London Road to the rear of the Fox Public House, which is currently has permission for static mobile homes.
Site Description and Development Potential

5.1 Site Option 68 is located north of Charters Piece and northeast of the playing field and is currently agricultural land (Grade 3). A plan of the site is included in Appendix 5. As an alternative to the representations for Site Option 134 above, Site Option 68 could be allocated for housing. Access could be provided via land in the north of the playing field. This could include an area for dedicated parking for the playing field reducing the need for parking on the A145 for village events.

5.2 The site is 0.64ha in size and is well related to the built form of the village. It is a square shape and has a flat topography. According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 19 dwellings on this part of the site.

5.3 More appropriately and reflecting the density of surrounding development this site could provide for around 10 to 15 dwellings (including 3 to 5 affordable homes) arranged in a manner sympathetic to the site and its location.

5.4 This could also include a vehicular access route through the north of the playing field site (as identified on the map in Appendix 5) with new parking provision for the playing field.

The site is bounded to the northwest and southeast by residential development, the playing field to the southwest and agricultural land to the northeast.

5.5 The location of the potential vehicular access has good visibility onto London Road. This would require relocating the existing play equipment elsewhere within the playing field but this would not be a significant exercise and would also lead to improvements and an increased level of safety and security on London Rd.

Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal

5.6 Consideration of Site Option 68 alongside Site Option 134 means it scores better in the Site Sustainability Assessment (SSA) than on its own.

5.7 Development of the playing field would necessitate moving it to Site Option 68 on a like for like basis. A village focal point would be retained on
Site Option 134.
6.0 Providing the village recreation facilities on Site Option 68 could include an area for dedicated parking for the playing field reducing the need for parking on the A145 for village events.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 69 - Land north of Church Lane, Ellough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Insufficient road access – narrow road with passing places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of a rich wildlife habitat, including buzzards, owls and bullfinches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullfinches are already in decline due to loss of nesting habitat. They are classified as an amber list species in the UK, under the Birds of Conservation Concern Review, and are a priority bird species on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A full survey would have to take place to access the full range of wildlife here, and what impact such disturbance would have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If &quot;Waveney has no significant areas of sensitive wildlife habitats,&quot; as stated on page 39, then why are sites rich in wildlife being chosen for possible building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 70 - Land north of Hall Lane, Oulton

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Section | Potential land for development 70 - Land north of Hall Lane, Oulton

Comment ID | 1126

Comment | We have already placed before you the virtues of each of the sites which we have submitted and make the point that, in the event of allocation, we are in a position to bring each forward for development within the early years of the plan.

We note particularly that adjacent to site 70, additional land to the north has been promoted but is constrained by access from Union Lane. We think that there is merit in looking at a comprehensive proposal for development in this area which can embrace the re-use of the Lothingland hospital site with a compressive scheme for access and new housing, served off Somerleyton Road and we would be pleased to discuss this proposition with you.
Environment Agency

Section | Potential land for development 70 - Land north of Hall Lane, Oulton

Comment ID | 1151

Comment | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:

Source Protection Zone 3

*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).

Historic England Debbie Mack

Section                  Potential land for development 70 - Land north of Hall Lane, Oulton

Comment ID               1035

Comment                  Proximity to Blue Boar Inn, grade II to the north east and the Manor House grade II * listed to the east. Potential impact upon the setting of high grade and other listed buildings.
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section  Potential land for development 70 - Land north of Hall Lane, Oulton

Comment ID  966

Comment  • Sites not suitable for development:

70 Land North of Hall Lane

We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure.
Henstead with Hulver Street Parish Council John Armstrong

Section Potential land for development 71 - Land north of Hulver Street, Henstead With Hulver Street

Comment ID 1233

Comment The Parish Council considered the questions you asked it to provide information about. They agreed that the proposed sites for possible development were unsuitable in terms of the number of houses projected for the sites. As I explained in my previous response the Councillors did not feel that they could respond to the other questions about jobs and facilities until after the consultations with residents in the development of the neighbourhood plan.
Potential land for development 71 - Land north of Hulver Street, Henstead With Hulver Street

Moore

Section
Potential land for development 71 - Land north of Hulver Street, Henstead With Hulver Street

Comment ID 514

Comment
We consider this site is totally unsuitable for a housing development of 60 homes as it would put a mini Housing Estate in a totally unsuitable area with no facilities or services. There is no public transport through the village so all journeys would have to be taken by car to beccles, Lowestoft or Norwich for shopping, medical facilities, leisure/entertainment. 60 houses could easily include well over a hundred vehicles and access onto the B1127 could cause a lot of problems. The area has no schools, doctors, or even village shop. There is nothing (not even a safe play area) for young children, no recreation for teenagers, no meeting place for the elderly and we therefore oppose this site for housing development.

The area could possibly be utilised for an alternative purpose to add benefit to the existing residents in the area. a dedicated open space could be an ideal place for dog-walking, sports facilities and/or a children's play area. It might also be suitable for a Medical Health Centre, Day Care centre or Recreation Centre to give people somewhere to meet in the day or evenings.
I strongly object to the development of this rural site. The site, a grass field managed for hay and with low density grazing, lies within the AONB and is currently an established site for several breeding pairs of turtle dove, the UK's fastest declining farmland bird species, and has been since at least 2014. It is also used regularly by other bird species of conservation interest such as barn owl, buzzard and red kite and species such as swift, which nest in the village, feed over it regularly. A housing development on the site would destroy this critical breeding site for turtle doves and affect other species adversely and therefore represents a serious loss of biodiversity. The scale of the development is also out of all proportion to the size of the village and would change its character. The B1127 is an increasingly busy road with the opening of the anaerobic digester, parachuting organisation, crematorium and industrial site expansion and a large housing estate would add considerably to this and make the road even more dangerous. There is no mains drainage in the village and a development of similar size to the village or larger would add to drainage and possibly pollution issues. Flooding of the Hundred River, especially in the lower sections of the grass field, is also an issue.
**Suffolk County Council James Cutting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 71 - Land north of Hulver Street, Henstead With Hulver Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The county council welcomes the reference to the Beccles South Relief Road and encourages the district authority to mark the route on the Beccles site map. Subject to any further assessments, the proposed level of growth around Beccles is generally acceptable with the exception of the following sites 124, 50, 71, and 77 since these are all further out from the town centre and less likely to encourage sustainable travel choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 71 - Land north of Hulver Street, Henstead With Hulver Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Based on aerial photographs, site 71 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that this site should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that it may have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK Hannah Lorna Bevins

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID
1139

Comment
The following sites have been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/ HP apparatus:
* 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane
* 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road
* 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road
* 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane

National Grid Gas Distribution would like to take this opportunity to advise prospective land developers and the local authority of the following:
Crossing of assets: Construction traffic should only cross the pipeline at locations agreed with National Grid. To facilitate these crossings protection or diversion may be required; depending on site condition and pipe parameters.
Cable Crossings: For all assets, the contractor / developer will need to consider the clearance and necessary protection measures. The crossing must be perpendicular to the asset. The crossing may require a deed of consent to be agreed prior to work commencing.
Piling: No piling should take place within 15m of gas distribution assets without prior agreement from a National Grid Representative.
Pipeline Safety: National Grid will need to ensure that access to the pipelines is maintained during and after construction.
Our HP/IP pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation to be monitored by a National Grid representative. Ground cover above gas distribution mains should not be reduced or increased. Our MP/LP mains will not be as deep as the pipelines.
A National Grid representative may be required to monitor any excavations or any embankment or dredging works within 3 metres of a HP/IP pipeline or within 10 metres of an Above Ground Installations (AGI). Monitoring of works in relation to MP/LP assets may be required by a National Grid representative. National Grid steel pipelines are cathodically protected to prevent corrosion to the pipeline. For further information please refer to SSW/22 (see further advice section below).

If you require any further information in relation to the above please contact National Grid's Plant Protection team via the email address at the top of this letter.

Appendices - National Grid Assets
Please find attached in:
* Appendix 1 provides maps of the sites referenced above in relation to the affected National Grid Gas Distribution (Intermediate Pressure /High Pressure) assets outlined above.
(map enclosed)
Andrew Nainby

**Section**
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

**Comment ID**
476

**Comment**
Development here would be a disaster. First and foremost the road infrastructure is totally inadequate. There would be no exit to the north because of the common, or to the east because of existing dwellings. Traffic (potentially 200 extra vehicles) would have to use the narrow roads and one way system to the west or add to the traffic on Lowestoft Road. This frequently backs up at weekends and dramatically so if there is an accident on the northern bypass (A146). A large part of the site is on the flood plain / marshes. New dwellings would be vulnerable to flooding and the natural drainage capacity would be reduced. It would destroy the Open Break between Beccles and Worlingham, comprise the tranquility of the Common, and threaten wildlife - particularly barn owls and kestrels that use the area as a hunting ground (although that would probably be good news for the rats!).
I understand that the area has a designation whereby development will only be permitted if there are no alternatives. There are alternative sites to the south of Beccles and the East of Worlingham where the transport infrastructure is more resilient and the drainage issues less severe.
andy house

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID 636

Comment although this might be a natural fill in area I think that the access routes would be problematic. There could be no link onto the A146 and linking to the centre of Beccles would add to congestion with the railway line getting in the way. linking to the lowestoft road would need lights or roundabout and would add traffic back on to the congestion at ingate
**Anonymous**

| Section | Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles  
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 72 unsuitable for development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barry Spall

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID 662

Comment
The break between Beccles and Worlingham needs to be retained. This land constitutes the only open view eastwards remaining in the Waveney Valley. It is a rich natural source for flora, fauna and supports barn owls, kingfishers, kestrels sticklebats and much more. The land is situated on flood plain and adjacent to marshes. The recent development at Brick Kiln Farm has encountered major water problems from springs requiring continuous pumping and pipeing water to adjacent marshes. More building would lead to more water absorption to go where? The current sewage and water services are at full stretch. Health services, schools cannot take additional population and the roads not suitable in the area for further development. I have with permission of the deceased former owner walked this area for over thirty years, it is not suitable for building and will lead to enormous problems if developed. This land requires protection to avert potentially drastic environmental disaster.
Beccles Society Paul Fletcher

**Section**  
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

**Comment ID**  
691

**Comment**  
The following comments relate specifically to Plot 72  
The Beccles Society notes that although Plot 72 has been entered into the document "Option for the new Local Plan" as a single parcel by a developer, the parcel actually comprises a combination of land areas having different owners.  
The WDC document describes the plot as 'Land north of Lowestoft Road' and Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane). The description is somewhat vague but for ease the society has looked at each as follows:  
1. Land north of Lowestoft Road.  
This land appears to be privately owned and currently forms a 'green barrier' between Beccles and Worlingham.  
Following public consultation Waveney District Council published their 'Green Infrastructure Strategy' in 2015. This document described the land north of Lowestoft Road (between Marsh View and Park Drive) as follows:  
- Provides visual amenity and physical separation between the built up areas of Beccles and Worlingham. Vegetation in the south western part of the site screens existing development and helps integrate the area into the wider surroundings. Seek to protect the open character and setting of the area. Consider identifying the site as an 'open break' as part of a review of the Local Plan.  
Permitting development on this site would therefore breach Waveney District Council's own strategy.  
Furthermore, our understanding is that this land carries a status whereby it would only be developed if no other land is available. Upon completion, the Southern Relief Road will create a natural southern boundary to Beccles/Worlingham containing considerable land suitable for development as indicated by plots 8/9/81/82 on page 48 of the 'Options for the new Waveney Local Plan'.  
The greater percentage of the land north of Lowestoft Road area is steeply sloped towards the river Waveney, as such it has a considerable effect on drainage/absorption of surface water run off from the built up areas of Worlingham, thus assisting in flood mitigation.  
The developer (LandPro Ltd) has stated to Waveney District Council that a
contract exists for the purchase of this land between themselves and the owner (i.e. plot 72). Consultation with Councillor Graham Elliott suggests that following his own investigation any such contract covers only that land described as 'north of Lowestoft Road', i.e. the land matching that included within the Green Infrastructure Strategy protection. The contract does not therefore apply to the entire area of plot 72.

Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane).

This land lies within the boundaries of the Beccles Town Council Estate as surveyed and mapped in 1980 (revised 1983) by S C Bromley C.Eng,C.I.M.E (then Beccles Borough Engineer). Subsequent to that date legal advice accepted by Beccles Town Council has confirmed that this is the original Elizabeth I Beccles Charter land. As such it is held by Beccles Fenland Charity Trust on behalf of the inhabitants of Beccles with Beccles Town Council as sole trustee. Beccles Town Council has advised that they have no knowledge of, nor have they authorised the inclusion of this land within the new Waveney Local Plan.

The Beccles Society strongly opposes the inclusion of plot 72 within any future local plans for the purposes of development. We believe that to lose this site to development will denigrate the area out of all proportion to the size of the plot. We also do not recognise that the area in question is required in order to meet expansion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Beccles Town Council C Boyne</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charles Fortt

**Section**  
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles  
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

**Comment ID**  
576

**Comment**  
Open land, especially allotments and proposed sites near common land, should not be developed intensively so as to eliminate all open space near Beccles town centre.
Chris HOLMES

Section | Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID | 264

Comment | I object to proposed development on this site on following grounds:
(1) Most of the proposed development is on a floodplain/marshland and would significantly reduce capacity for water to be absorbed naturally. This is a particularly important concern of mine as I reside in Old Farm Road, Beccles, a low lying area. I have already had to raise the level of my rear garden by some 9 inch to alleviate flooding problems in inclement weather (one third of garden area under 6 inch of water). Having watched the development of the four bungalows & two houses on the Brick Kiln Farm site, I noted that during the footings/foundations stage of building, the site had to have water continually pumped away. The dwelling constructions have now been completed and I note that work is already being undertaken to alleviate surface water dispersal problems.
(2) Sewage and water services in the area are at or near capacity already.
(3) The roads in the area are not wide enough to handle the inevitable increase in traffic volume that would be generated by additional housing.
(4) The land in question is part of the Waveney valley landscape and is home to a host of wildlife. Prior to the relatively small development of the Brick Kiln Farm estate, it was a regular occurrence to see pheasants, partridges, monk jack deer and the occasional fox wandering on the street outside my house. Not anymore.
(5) There are better alternative sites for development.
Councillor Caroline Topping

Section

Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID

977

Comment

Regarding where the new homes/businesses should be built. Plot 72 in Beccles is currently a mix of farming land, plus all the rugby, football, cricket, tennis provision in Beccles. If I can refer you to the WDC ‘Playing Pitch and Outdoors Sports Facilities Overview Consultation’ carried out a few years ago, findings as follows. 'Beccles has an existing football deficit of .5 mini-football pitch. Cricket existing deficit of 7 wickets. Rugby, existing deficit of .5 pitches and quality improvements required at College Meadow, particularly to resolve drainage issues which reduce capacity for games and practice (drainage issues which will not be resolved by building on). Hockey, existing deficit of 1 sand filled pitch resulting in hockey club travelling out of district to use facilities. Tennis, improve access at Beccles Tennis Club'. All these being within your designated 'plot 72' and being owned by Beccles Town Council and under dispute with the Charity commission as being part of the Beccles Fenland Charity.

Furthermore with regards to the WDC 'Open Space Needs Assessment' carried out by Jack Green. Open space provision in the District. 'The poorest provision is in Kessingland with Beccles, Bungay, etc having less provision per person than the District average'. The Biodiversity sites in the Market Towns, shows 'Beccles to have sites of biodiversity value', one such site being that which The Waveney Local Plan is showing as 'plot 72'. 
Graham and Sue Bergin

Section

Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID

241

Comment

This site should never be developed for the following reasons:-
1) Land status
The land carries a status whereby no development will be considered unless there are absolutely no alternative sites. There are plenty of alternatives – the logical place for any large scale development round Beccles is Ellough and land to the South of the town, i.e. land which will be encompassed by or adjacent to the new Southern Relief road.

We own Pinetrees, the site adjacent to the East of Site 72. When we bought the land in 2001 it came with planning permission for a block and render bungalow. When we sought to vary the consent, so that we could erect an environmentally friendly dwelling, we were told by Waveney DC that our site formed part of the Waveney Valley landscape and no additional development would be entertained. This must apply even more strongly to Site 72 as it is much more visible than Pinetrees, both from Lowestoft Road and the common.

In July 2015 a 'Green Infrastructure Strategy' was adopted by Waveney District Council and 'open breaks' are mentioned in this document. On page 27 it states that 'the open countryside located to the North side of Lowestoft Road between Marsh View and Park Drive (i.e. Site 72) should be considered for protection as an open break as part of a future review of the local plan'.

The summary table on pages 36 and 37 states that Site 72 provides visual amenity and physical separation between the built up areas of Beccles and Worlingham. The recommendation was to seek to protect the open character and setting of the area and to consider designating the site as an 'open break' as part of a review of the local plan. Benefits were stated to be protecting the setting and character of the two settlements.

2) Overcrowding of already congested roads.
The development of Site 72 will put unwelcome additional traffic onto the already inadequate local roads. Every day we see queues of traffic formed along Ingate since Grove Road was made one way – indeed, it is not uncommon for traffic to queue from the Peddars Lane traffic lights, up Ingate and past the Ellough Road traffic lights along Lowestoft Road.
The Common Lane/Grove Road area cannot cope with any more traffic as it is already busy due to the high number of car trips made by dog walkers heading to the common and also the large volume of cars at the weekends when there are field games.

3) Strain on already struggling sewage systems.
We believe that previous development applications have been refused on these grounds – what has changed? We understand Worlingham Marsh Lane sewage treatment works to be at the limit of capacity. Worlingham Ash Tree sewage treatment works is being pushed ever closer to capacity as a result of piecemeal development in the area. If this development went ahead, new and existing households in the area are likely to suffer from sewage removal problems unless the sewage infrastructure is radically uprated to cope with the extra households.

4) Strain on water supplies.
Some homes in Worlingham are already suffering from low water pressure at peak usage times.

5) Environmental risk.
At least 70% of this site is tidal flood plain or marshland. We understood that current environmental policy is not to permit building on flood plains. With global warming and rising sea levels the situation will become ever less favourable for development. Any houses built in known flood plains will find it difficult or expensive to obtain insurance against flooding. Development on the proposed scale within the flood plain will reduce the area available to cope with flood water. This will render our and other low lying property in the area more vulnerable to flooding. We, and we expect, other residents, will look to take legal action, via our household insurers, against Waveney DC if this situation arises. Please note that the houses recently built in this area have already experienced problems with drainage – the ditch which runs towards the corner of our land had to be dredged and the outflow remains weak.

6) Habitat.
The land is extremely important hunting ground and habitat for barn owls and kestrels which reside on and around the land.
**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Close to Beccles Conservation Area - potential impact upon Conservation Area and its setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Featherstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**    | Part of this site belongs to the inhabitants of Beccles which needs to be separated off. Apart from this the other issue is the lack of an open break between Beccles and Worthingham, we need to have a corridor of open space which will be lost should any building be allowed to go ahead on this site.  
My other concern is of flooding in this area, this is already listed on the environment's plan as a great flood risk area.  
I consider these two above mentioned concerns to be extremely important when looking at site 72, may I suggest it be removed from the plan. |
John Eade

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID
305

Comment
I live close to this site and consider that it is not suitable for significant development. It forms an important green corridor between Beccles and Worlingham and is important to the nature of the Waveney Valley. The site has reed-beds on it and development will cause additional problems with flooding in other areas of Beccles. The site is important for wildlife with deer, owls, marsh harriers and many other species regularly being seen on it. Access to the site is also difficult and will cause significant traffic problems.
Judy Taylor

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID
602

Comment
Our view is that existing infrastructure, ie Medical and Dental services, roads, schools, water and sewerage services simply do not have the capacity for such a development. If this number of homes were to be built on the outskirts of Beccles it would result in an influx of around 7,500 people - imagine the adverse impact on the existing residents.
Section 72 - Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID 352

Comment
This site is part of the Waveney Valley Landscape and forms the natural break between Worlingham and Beccles. It forms the natural habitat for kestrels and barn owls. The majority of the site is floodplain/marshland. The impact of local flooding around the area would increase should there be any development. The site has a designation whereby development should be a last resort - as there are many other less environmentally sensitive sites being offered around Waveney this site is not critical for Waveney's development plans. In the Worlingham Parish Plan - 74% of respondents advised that the environment around Worlingham is 'very important' and a further 21% said it was 'important.' In accordance with the Green Infrastructure Strategy this site should not be considered as a prime development site.
**Marya Parker**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This development would remove the last remaining space between Beccles &amp; Worlingham making them contiguous. Some separation between the two settlements is desirable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haycock

Section  
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles  
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID  
453

Comment  
Site 72 seems singularly inappropriate for significant development, given its fenland character. Also, it represents a long-standing northern 'break' between Beccles and Worlingham.

Repeating my earlier request that Worlingham be separated from 'Beccles with Worlingham' in this planning exercise, I would not like to see massive dormitory developments built on sites such as site 82. Development should be 'pocket like' and proportionate to the size of the village community.
Manders

**Section**  
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles  
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

**Comment ID**  
252

**Comment**  
This land is of huge value and interest to the people of Beccles not only does it contain the sports pavilion, scout and guide hall but also the youth football and rugby clubs pitches, this is used by hundreds of Beccles people both young and old. The land adjacent to the Lowestoft road allows a special view over the marshes and on to the common which has a lot of history for the town. I have personally seen barn owls, bats, deer, hedgehogs and foxes and a huge verity of birds. I’m sure building on this land would have an irreversible and detrimental affect on the wildlife.
Hilda Jackson

Section  
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID  
632

Comment  
I think it would be a shame to infill this natural break between developed areas of Beccles and Worlingham.
On a practical issue, it would appear that much of the land toward the north is potentially wet and marshy.
The area is close to the Broads and development would have an unfavourable impact on the flora and fauna of the area.
nicholas roe

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID
414

Comment
In answer to the question ninety five and ninety six in the consultation document. The land has always been a natural break and is regarded as part of the Waveney valley landscape most of the proposed development is on floodplain/marshland and would reduce the capability of the land to absorb water with potentially adverse consequences for residents for low lying properties. The site currently has a designated wherby development will only be permitted if there are no alternative. In answer to question seven Beccles doesn't need allocated any more than 10-15% housing as part of the local offer. The consultation document shows clearly that there are many better alternative sites for development. Sewage and water services in the area are at or near capacity. One hundred and thirty additional homes will not help the situation. The roads in the area were intended to handle the additional traffic this development will cause. The Green Infrastructure Strategy supports the need for green spaces which supports the network of wildlife. The land is prime hunting ground for kestrels and barn owls.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicky Elliott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pat Took

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID
1222

Comment
I was horrified to see that Site 72 appears to include all the land which is currently used as sports facilities - rugby, football, tennis, etc. - and allotments. I agree that as the population increases there will be a need for more housing, but I also hold the view that the more "built up" an area becomes, open areas for sports and outdoor activities become even more important, for the health and well-being of the local residents. It seems a very retrograde step to even consider using this land for building.
Quite a large proportion of the land within Site 72 is prone to flooding; whilst this is an occasional nuisance to sports organisations, it would be catastrophic if it were to be used for housing. Additionally, the construction of buildings on flood-prone land would exacerbate flooding issues because water would not be able to drain away.
The existing roads in this area - Common Lane, Old Farm Road, Grove Road etc - are relatively narrow, and would struggle to accommodate the inevitable increase in traffic if more houses were built, and there appears no option to construct wider access roads.
The marshland which lies between Old Farm Road and Worlingham Park Drive is an unspoilt habitat for a varied assortment of wildlife (including Barn Owls), and the open view over this marshland from Lowestoft Road towards Beccles Common is one of the jewels of Beccles. Destroy this, and you take away one of the things which make Beccles a special place for residents and tourists alike.
To sum up, I strongly object to any further development of land within Site 72, at any time in the future.
Paul Gurbutt

Section Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID 132

Comment Is this not an area of Beccles Fen which is charity land and does not belong to WDC but the Trustees.
Jonathan Blankley

Section  Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID  107

Comment  There is already a lack of sufficient space for all the existing sports clubs. Urgent consideration must be given to increasing the available space to allow the clubs to continue to grow just as the town is doing. Both local football clubs and the rugby club struggle to operate in their current confines, and a permanent solution needs to be found. There can be no consideration given to the loss of any of these existing facilities, and all future developments in the town should contribute to providing suitable additional facilities to enable them to provide a full range of activities to all those that wish to participate.
Philip Whyte

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID 253

Comment
I am against this proposal go the following reasons:
The roads to this area are not constructed for the extra traffic
The majority of this area is on floodplain & marshland which floods regularly and the extra infrastructure would only magnify this and my property would undoubtedly suffer
The infrastructure predominantly sewage is not capable of taking the extra quantities
The area is a prime piece of the Waveney valley rich in wildlife, specifically owls.
I feel there are better alternative sites available
Roger Moore

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID 278

Comment
- This land is a natural break between Beccles and Worlingham
- This land is floodplain
- Beccles is already service limited and cannot handle without significant investment in infrastructure any additional large number of people
- This is prime farm land and hunting grounds for birds (Owls and Kestrels)
- There are many more suitable locations for such a development
- Roads around this area are already full and the addition traffic will cause significant on going delays
Ronald Pigney

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID
349

Comment
I would like to strongly oppose the development of this land on the following grounds:
This area is regarded as part of the Waveney Valley landscape with a natural break between Worlingham and Beccles.
There could be adverse consequences of developing on this marshland/floodplain - reducing the absorbency of water and therefore increasing risk to low lying properties.
From our garden we have seen muntjac deer, foxes, snakes, numerous birds including buzzards, barn owls, tawny owls, black caps, woodpeckers, doves, tits, finches etc. This would seriously threaten their existence.
These roads were never intended for this level of extra development, particularly Grove Road in terms of access and parking.
I would like to strongly recommend that should there be a requirement for development, that the Ellough Road site proposed would be a far better proposition due to the new access road linking London road and Lowestoft Road.
Rosemary Hewlett

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID
95

Comment
I attended the consultation on 4th May at Beccles and am very concerned about one of the areas on the map shown in blue number 72. Part of this land either side of Common Lane, now a cricket pitch and a rugby field, are part of the Charter Lands and belong to the people of Beccles. This land, containing a sports complex, is at the moment part of an investigation by the Charity Commission and Waveney District Council. The land should be registered as charitable even if it stays with WDC as trustees and therefore until this matter is resolved I do not see how it can be put forward for development.

I have already responded to the Larkfleet consultation which is number 82 but will reiterate again here. This is too big a development for a small town like Beccles which is suffering already because of traffic/parking issues and lack of doctors' surgeries.

We are also very short of open spaces suitable for children to play and feel this needs addressing before any more houses are b
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sharon Shersby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SJLHS david hall

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID
259

Comment
1. access to the area is poor which will be made worse by more housing
2. The area floods annually especially at the avenue end of beef meadow.
3. what improvements are likely to be made to existing sports provision - none mentioned or highlighted.
4. parking at weekends especially sept - april is at times very difficult with footballers/rugby/golfers and dog walkers.
stephanie clarke

Section  Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID  227

Comment  I cannot believe this land has been submitted. It is marsh land & many times it is water logged. It's dykes used to be used to take the access water away from the river to avoid flooding the quay & low lying areas of the town. The land provides homes for a large variety of wildlife including Barn Owls, Buzzards & a large population of water vole. The sports facilities are heavily used (these pitches, esp during winter suffer from waterlog) and it is wrong to take these from its users.
Stephen Malster

**Section**  
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles  
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

**Comment ID**  
364

**Comment**  
The land sectioned on the attached map as No – 72 includes the land that I rent from Beccles Fenland Charity Trust, that has been leased for use as a wholesale nursery (horticultural) since 1969* and town records denote this area for agricultural/horticultural use since at least 1850.

My understanding is that the land legally belongs to the people of Beccles as common land and was in the process of being registered under the new Beccles Fenland Charity Trust. I would therefore contest that this land could not be sold neither be considered for potential development even at only preliminary stage.

It is also low lying land that I have personally experienced flooding to an approx. depth of 18 inches, twice during the last 30 years. The land available also via Common Lane causes significant traffic flow problems when existing facilities are in use.

Please inform me of any issues in relation to the land.

*Beccles Museum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sue Rhodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane),
Beccles

Comment ID 735

Comment
Based on aerial photographs, site 72 may contain habitats and species of
conservation value. We therefore consider that this site should not be
allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would
not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they
have.
Susan Doherty

Section
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID
927

Comment
Most of this land belongs to the people of Beccles, bequeathed to us in 1584 by Elizabeth I in a legal document named 'Beccles Charter', and is named Goose Green. Why is this area on Waveney's potential development land? Who put it into this plan? Who is the developer named as 'origin'? This land is charity land, has the charity commission been informed, have the owners been consulted, namely us the inhabitants? Has our land been sold behind our backs?
Susan Doherty

Section  
Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles 
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), 
Beccles

Comment ID  
928

Comment  
I am writing with concerns over site No 72 on your map – Beccles RUFC Common Lane, land N.W. and S.E. Common Lane, housing and open space, number of homes 130. 
This land belongs to the inhabitants of Beccles town, bequeathed to them in a Charter dated 1584 by Elizabeth I, and ratified in 1605 by James I. 
Beccles town council manage this land on behalf of us the rightful owners as part of our ancient fenland. 
Why have we the owners not been consulted on this matter as by law we should have been? 
Why is "Developer" listed as origin and who is this developer? 
When was this land taken from its rightful owners and where is the proof? 
This is an extremely serious matter to which I should like some answers.
Terence White

Section  Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID  411

Comment  Whilst I can appreciate the use of the north section of this site to add recreational and sports facilities adjacent to those existing, even though access roads are already a problem, I feel to develop the balance of the site with housing would be detrimental to the well being of Beccles. The parcel of land along Lowestoft Road and leading over the marsh down to the common forms a natural break from the town and the urban area of Worlingham. It forms a natural 'lung' to the old town.
When viewed from the Lowestoft Road public footpath it can clearly be seen how wonderful this area is with views across the marsh, common, woodlands and on a clear day over as far as Aldeby. It is just as impressive as any other view from the towns boundaries such as from Ballygate over the countryside. This natural area is home to numerous breeds of wildlife and birds and in particular the barn owls. It is an area well worth preserving as part of the Waveney Valley Landscape.
Logistically there seems little scope for accommodating additional traffic that 130 houses would bring. The Common Lane, Grove Road, Marsh View areas are already over used and the access through Grove Road is a nightmare. Any access onto Lowestoft Road would cause even more congestion leading into the town. On Saturdays in particular cars back up from Ingate along Lowestoft Road waiting to get into town. This is multiplied 10 fold when the bypass is closed for works or accidents.
It seems to me there are much better areas to accommodate new housing around the town in particular to the south between London Road and the Ellough area where the new link road could be designed as an artery to take the additional traffic. The south and east areas have already had new developments tagged on to this part of Beccles so surely there must be more modern services and drainage facilities to these already that could be tapped into. No such services or drains exist at site 72.
Another area worth considering would be to the west side of London Road when heading out of town between the Cemetary and the Ringsfield turning?
In summary, as a Beccles resident for over 60 years I feel turning site 72 from a natural area into urban sprawl would be detrimental to my home
town.
Mr. T J White.
Teresa Cooper

Section Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID 396

Comment In line with the Green Infrastructure Strategy we believe that the 'Open break' between Beccles & Worthingham (designated site 72 on Consultation document) should be preserved.

This open break provides vital breading and habitat grounds for barn owls and kestrels. On this site we have also seen, foxes and cubs, herons and many other varieties of birds. This wildlife would be lost if this Open break was lost.

This open break also provides much needed marshland for surface water to drain to. As residents of Lowestoft road we regularly see (during a downpour) the Lowestoft road looking like a river. Currently water can drain quite naturally down to the marshes. If this land is built on, the water would quite naturally drain into peoples houses! With our property on the Lowestoft road it is clear that water from behind our house (Ellough Road upwards) drains through our land down to this marshland. The Quay already floods, by building housing on other flood plains it will just raise the water levels in these risk areas even more. There are higher areas in Beccles that could be built on. For example extending the housing at Ellough.

Beccles has very few green areas for the public to enjoy. There are no communal gardens. The only areas are the quay (swamped by holiday makers in the summer) the Puddingmoor play area (swamped by mud and water in the winter) and the common. The area proposed to be built on can very clearly be seen from Beccles common. It will hardly be a relaxing area to enjoy if within a few hundred yards there is mass housing stretching right up to the Lowestoft road.

There are better alternative sites for development than this. The surrounding roads will not handle the increased traffic of this development. Sewage and water services are at or near capacity and will not support 130 additional homes.
Woodview Farm Melvyn Searby

Section | Potential land for development 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles
RUFC Common Lane (land north west and south east of Common Lane), Beccles

Comment ID | 500

Comment | We have lived at Woodview Farm for the last 35 years and the proposed development would be adjacent to the southern boundary of our land. We are against the development for several reasons. We are concerned about the increased risk of flooding to our land and property as we are in a very low lying area and the run off from the concrete will flow straight downhill towards the Common where we live. We have experienced severe flooding on the marshes at the rear of our home on several occasions in the past and witnessed children and their teachers being trapped inside the building known as the Guide Hut on Common Lane with deep water swirling around the building and preventing their escape. This shows there is already a problem, any new houses will just increase the flood risk. We are extremely concerned that yet another area of habitat, for wildlife will be lost as well as the lovely view across the fields, looking up towards Worlingham from Beccles Common. We have run a dog boarding kennels at our property since 1983 and have a license for 24 dogs. Our planning permission must have been granted in the knowledge that we are isolated and have no neighbouring houses. Any new houses built on this site will hear dogs barking throughout the day. Another reason for our objection is that the roads in this area are already congested with traffic and the one way system makes it very difficult to get out of Common Lane onto Grove Road and up the hill, then onto Lowestoft Road towards Beccles where the traffic is frequently gridlocked. With the new houses and increased number of vehicles this will be very difficult.
## Potential land for development 73 - Land north of Moores Cottages, Holton

**Halesworth Town Council N Rees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 73 - Land north of Moores Cottages, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Similarly, Sites 73 and 121,103, 148 are classified as Holton and HTC and Holton would need to look at this together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic England Debbie Mack</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 73 - Land north of Moores Cottages, Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Proximity to Moat Farm house, grade II. Potential impact on setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezr Leverett

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 73 - Land north of Moores Cottages, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 73; 121 Both these sites look to be outside the village envelope but there is already a 'local community' in this area and an innovative, environmentally designed scheme for local need could be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 74 - Land north of Morton Peto Close, Somerleyton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This site is not suitable for housing development as it is a priceless piece of open land, development here would result in the whole Morton Peto Close area being very heavily developed and out of keeping with the rural nature of the village, the land is landscaped with trees and is within the conservation area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  Potential land for development 74 - Land north of Morton Peto Close, Somerleyton

Comment ID  1038

Comment  Located within the Conservation Area and opposite Widows Cottage, grade II listed. Potential impact upon Conservation Area and setting of Listed Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Julie Reynolds</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Douch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Somerleyton Estate Lord Somerleyton  
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

**Section**  
Potential land for development 74 - Land north of Morton Peto Close, Somerleyton

**Comment ID**  
1184

**Comment**  
Site Description and Development Potential  
11.1 Site Option 74 is located off The Street and is north of Morton Peto Close. The site is currently informal open space and a pedestrian footpath joins The Street with Station Road on its eastern boundary. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 9. The site is 0.28ha in size. According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 8 (including an allowance for 2 affordable homes) dwellings on this part of the site. The site is referred to in the Issues and Options consultation document as being 0.24ha and this is incorrect.  
11.2 Based on nearby residential density we consider the site is capable of accommodating at least 5 dwellings. The site is an irregular shape but this provides opportunities to orientate development to minimise amenity impacts on neighbouring properties and complement the urban form in this part of the village. This site is submitted for housing. It can have direct access onto The Street as shown on the site plan. Development of this land could go hand in hand with other nearby potential submission sites. The loss of this informal amenity space could be more than compensated for with the provision of greater alternatives nearby – this is indicated on the site plan.  
Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal  
11.3 The site sustainability appraisal (SSA) at Point 1 states "proposed loss of open space". This is incorrect. Our submission to the Call for Sites consultation stated "Development of this land could go hand in hand with other nearby potential submission sites. The loss of this informal amenity space could be more than compensated for with the provision of greater alternatives nearby – this is indicated on the site plan". The SSA at Point 1 also refers to "limited community facilities in the village". This is incorrect. The Waveney village profile or Somerleyton confirms that there is a full suite of key facilities and this needs to be recognised.
Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Audrey Grapes

Section
Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID 875

Comment
I first moved to Lound in 1988, attracted by its idyllic appearance – country pub, post office, village shop.
Over time the street in Lound has become a short-cut for traffic from A143 – Bradwell / Gorleston to Oulton Broad / Lowestoft, and because of the winding nature of the road, difficult to negotiate. In spite of 30 mph limit drivers constantly exceed this – often on mobile phones!
Lots of the existing properties are terraced and obviously do not have car spaces. Both the shop and Post Office are gone. The re-opened public house has generated more traffic, weekends as many as 12 cars parked alongside the pond, nose-to-tail, and in front of my property.
To introduce more houses, more cars with no amenities, bad drainage, access – particularly from proposed site 75 – seem most inappropriate.
Changes in climate has seen Jay Lane / Church Lane, Lound Main Street and Blacksmith’s Loke regularly turned into virtual rivers in the last two weeks alone. Drains have been overwhelmed.
I hope that instead of just looking at plans on paper in offices, your committee will hold more site meetings to fully investigate the fors and against such plans that you have before you, not just ‘rubber stamp’ them through.
Bear in mind: lack of schools / no doctors surgery, no amenities, minimal public transport, lack of adequate drainage.
Barbara James

Section: Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID: 871

Comment: This area is owned by Somerleyton Estates – so why should they plan to build in Lound.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Same answers as for 167 (The good things about living in Lound is the peace and tranquillity of an unspoilt Suffolk village, there are very few of these quaint little villages left, this is the reason we choose to retire here 16 years ago its outrageous to even think our little village could take 213 houses with the sewerage system and extra traffic, we have no facilities the school has been shut and also our post office / shop.) If this project goes ahead it will set a precedence throughout the village and there will be many more applications including individual applications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bruce James

Section
Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID
938

Comment
I have enjoyed life at Lound for many years. I consider this area as my heritage and find worrying the proposals here by the New Waveney Local Plan.
At present the village area has about 70-80 dwellings on 9 acres of land. The proposed site 167 would use a further 17 acres of "prime agricultural" land to provide a further 138 dwellings.
Such a large development would effectively triple the amount we have now and I fear would prove the present infrastructure unable to cope.
Jay Lane and Church Lane, the main route into our village, are in a disgusting state of repair with pothole and flooding problems and should not be subjected to further traffic without substantial repairs.
Lound sewage struggles to pump 1 1/4 miles from Back Lane to Hopton on Sea thus burdening their capacity in Norfolk.
Until now Lound has managed to remain a neatly compact village but if such a large development is allowed, sprawling eastward into open countryside the village’s present charm and character would be lost forever.
The large site 167 extends onto low damp ground and thus is not ideal for building. There are drainage ditches along its northern and western sides which are essentially maintained to prevent the even lower Blacksmith's Loke area from storm flood.
The smaller proposed site 75 is also low wet ground. I can remember a pond there next to the road, development here would likely create further drainage problems.
My steadfast belief is that prime agricultural land should be preserved to feed an ever increasing population whilst the poorer and brownfield used for housing.
I say both proposed sites 75 and 167 are therefore unsuitable for housing development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harry Jarvis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hilary Baker

Section Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID 436

Comment I don't think houses should be built on this site. This is outside the existing area of the village, and would be an extension of the village. The site is next to Snakes Lane, which is a well used bridleway and part of the Waveney Way. Houses in this location would be obtrusive and spoil the views you get of Lound as you approach the village along Snakes Lane.
**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Mardle House grade II listed building immediately to the north. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Kent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>This site seems a more appropriate for the expansion of the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jane Harrison

Section Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID 627

Comment I do not think this site is suitable as a housing development area. The Street is already a very busy road through the village, there is already housing on both sides of the Street, and parked cars on both sides. Cars speed through the village already, and at peak times it can be quite dangerous, with cars, buses and lorries trying to pass through. We also have a popular pub and café, with limited parking available at the pub, this often enhances the problem. The addition of extra houses, and therefore vehicles would add to the problem, and also create a potentially dangerous junction onto the Street from the housing area.
Jennifer Ozinel

Section  Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID  515

Comment  This site is in a beautiful part of the village. Many visitors come to the duck pond and to walk up Snakes Lane. They all say how peaceful it is and how pleasant it is to be able to walk in the countryside with no cars. I would prefer Lound to stay as it is now, with just a few additional houses but not large new housing estates. Even a development of 12 houses as proposed for this site would alter the character of the village. A recent visitor from London commented on how clean the air is and how quiet it is with the loudest noise being the sound of birdsong. We want to keep it that way.
Jon Lovelock

Section Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID 55

Comment With the pub reopening the amount of traffic coming onto the main street has increased and with the addition of 12 houses this will only make it worse. The land is already very boggy around there and if it were to be concreted then it would cause even more problems to the drainage of the village. The village pond with the pub opposite is a prefect example of village life, it is not needed to put new houses opposite that, it will take the view away. The extra noise created by the works and then the houses could also deter wildlife from settling there.
Judith Hobbs

Section  
Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID  
75

Comment  
It might be reasonable to 'infill' on this plot, preferably affordable/shared ownership. It would be acceptable to allow some small development and the village is very short of this type of property, a situation made worse by several cottages becoming holiday lets.

However, this field is within the catchment of The Mardle (the village pond), and is very boggy at the eastern end, and frequently under water for weeks at a time when the water table is high.

I think that no more than say, six houses on this site, leaving the eastern end still as open space/screening from the road. Six new houses, rather than the twelve projected, is really enough for a village of this size, in any context. (see also my comments on Plot No. 167)

There is also an issue of safety; even with only six houses, there are likely to be a dozen or so additional vehicles turning in and out of what is a tricky access, with poor sight lines, adjacent to the pub and its carpark, and to The Mardle, where there are often parked cars and visitors wandering about.
kevin morgan

Section Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID 306

Comment As already mentioned Lound is a small village which is part of the attraction for most who live here. I also suspect this is not the first time that property developers have tried to build in or around the village. I would say the infrastructure of the village would not withstand the development of this kind, we have major flooding on certain roads / land around the village every year without fail. The sewage system seems to also flood at times in Back Lane possibly overloaded? So I suspect this would not be able to sustain further development. The village is surrounded by open countryside and employment mainly comes from agricultural or horticultural sector, so employment I would say will be very limited in this area. So with next to nil opportunities for employment / no schools & facilities, any occupiers of any new homes would need to commute in order to find work etc. This would therefore increase the traffic flow on rural roads and lanes that surround the village by a considerable amount, they are barely adequate at peak times at present. Further to the traffic issues I suspect any development on both sites will cause traffic problems for residents both entering and exiting the village during building so again increased traffic and disruption will be caused which is unacceptable to residents of the village. It's difficult to see what positive effect such development proposals will have on the village. The feeling is that it will destroy rural nature of the village and the surrounding countryside and increased noise pollution and turn the village into an estate. This development will not enhance the village in anyway the only enhancement will be to the developers bank account as they try to squeeze another few rabbit hutches on a plot of land while destroying another English village in the process.
Louis Smith

Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID 320

Comment
This site is not suitable for development as it is in a very prominent position in the heart of a small rural village. New houses, particularly the number suggested, would be obtrusive and would not fit into the existing character of the village. The site is next to the village pond (The Mardle) where many people come to feed the ducks and enjoy the tranquil countryside. Snakes Lane is currently a peaceful bridleway (part of the Waveney Way), and building on this site would spoil the view as you approach Lound along this path.

Lound is a very small village and even a modest scheme as suggested would increase the number of dwellings by around 8% - this is likely to change the character of the village.

This site has a surface water drainage problem - heavy rainfall causes water to run off the fields from West to East and collect along the eastern boundary of this site. Because of this the site is no longer used to grow crops, but is used as a horse paddock. I know this will not prevent building, but it will add to costs.

There are no shops, schools, or jobs in Lound, and only a limited bus service. Everything is a car journey away, so building new houses in Lound is not sustainable development.

Lound is suitable for limited infill development that fits into the existing style of the village. This suggested development goes beyond that.

There must surely be more appropriate sites for development in Waveney that would not spoil open country views and alter the character of the existing settlement.
Lound Parish Council John Burford

Section Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID 953

Comment Lound Parish Council had an extraordinary Parish Council meeting on 3rd May to discuss our reaction to the Waveney Local Plan consultation. This was attended by Parish Councillors and 30 members of the public, a very large turnout for our small village.

Everyone at the meeting was horrified by the two potential development sites which were put forward (site numbers 75 and 167), and the number of houses being suggested which would double the size of the village.

A lengthy and fruitful discussion took place where the members of the public freely shared their views. There was wholesale opposition to any large housing development in the village. Everyone agreed that any development in the village should be small in scale and within the existing character and built area of the village. The pertinent points of opposition in relation to the suggested development sites were:

- Inappropriate size
- Change the nature of the village
- The need to preserve nature and the environment
- Take away the possibility of church yard extension
- Owl and Bat habitat, both of which are protected species
- Flooding will occur to existing properties if building takes place on what is 'a flood plain.'
Moira Selvage

Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID: 200

Comment: This unique and picturesque village of Lound with a round tower church and mardle, would not be suitable for a site building 148 houses, or indeed for the plot for 14 houses. The site by the Village Maid would not only destroy the tranquil beauty of the village, but be a most inappropriate site along the main street with its traffic possibly causing congestion and danger. The aesthetic value of Lound's pastoral views and the enjoyment it affords villagers and the many visitors will be an enormous loss. The country walks, appreciation of flora and fauna, doggie walking, horse riding, bird watching will indeed affect the uniqueness of this historic village if building on such a gigantic scale is allowed. Lound could possibly sustain the building of a house here or there, but THINK AGAIN in 20/30 years time what it might be like with concrete jungle tearing apart a jewel of a village. Preservation not destruction should be the right route to contemplate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr DJ &amp; Mrs CA Tooke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A W Baker

Section  Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID  370

Comment  Lound is a quiet country village spoilt by cars exceeding the 30mph speed limit and with cars parked each side of the road it causes a bottleneck and as there is talk of building 12 houses opposite The Mardle (pond) where there is quite a lot of wildlife, often crossing the road, many getting run over by vehicles, this could destroy them with the extra traffic from the new build. The environment would be changed and the area will deteriorate making it completely different to as we know it.
A Woods

Section      Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID  315

Comment      It's a pity because I love living in Lound and we know there is need for more houses. But 600 more people to come here no more village. Is this also to do with work in north sea. I hope there are less houses built. But I think it is to do with money like always.
Mr R Lubbock & Mrs J Cockram

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We like the village as it is. It is quiet and friendly and a great place to live. We have enough idiots who drive through at well above 30 and we also have enough residents that need to park on the road making speeding cars cause a problem for people. To build the proposed amount on both sites will only increase this problem as the infrastructure will not be able to support another 200 plus regular vehicles. We will lose the fragile tranquility we have at present. We agree housing is needed, but this amount will cause problems on our very country roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ms Francis Harvey and Mr Paul Church**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>I feel that the two proposed building sites are unsuitable for housing development. Site 75 is only a small paddock used for years for grazing horses. Twelve houses would be rather a lot for such a small area of land. It is also prone to flooding badly in the winter and leads straight out onto the busy through road. It is also alongside the start of a bridleway for horses, which would then be spoilt with too many people using it from the newly built houses for walks etc. There are hardly any bridleways for horses around this area anyway, so to spoil one of the only ones round here would be such as shame.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rita Flatt

Section: Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound

Comment ID: 120

Comment: The smaller area i.e. the parcel of land twixt pub and Mardle House, owned by the Somerleyton Estate. This I believe is the only site highlighted by the Estate in the parish, but there are other sites i.e. the cowsheds running alongside the road further north which are in serious need of attention. Do these come under a different category? This is a boggy site, subject to flooding at the corner nearest the lane, but has been a pasture for grazing horses certainly since the 1940s, when I have a photo of the late Captain Flatt's horse grazing thereon. The Parish Council have obtained three preservation orders on the three oaks situate on the roadside fence. The road is pretty narrow, with a sharp bend, subject to a 'slow' notice written on the road, to the north. Visibility and access difficult.
**Somerleyton Estate Lord Somerleyton**  
**Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 75 - Land north of Snakes Lane, The Street, Lound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | 1.0 Introduction  
1.1 Waveney District Council is responsible for setting the amount of housing and employment land is required in Waveney in the future. They are in the early stages of preparing a new local plan which will determine the number and location of new housing and employment sites in the District for the period up to 2036.  
1.2 Evolution Town Planning have been instructed by the Somerleyton Estate to make representations to this public consultation. This is an early stage in the process whereby the Council allocates sites for housing and employment development.  
1.3 This report includes commentary on the Site Option 75 in Lound. Our responses to the consultation Questions have been submitted under separate cover on the District Council’s proforma and a copy is provided here in Appendix 1.  
1.4 Evolution Town Planning (ETP) are experienced in promoting small rural sites either through development plan representations or planning applications. We also have site assessment experience from working in Council planning departments. As a practice we have 30 years of combined professional experience in this type of work.  
1.5 These representations include a potential housing site in Lound. The site is north of Snakes Lane and adjacent to the Village Maid Public House and opposite the village pond. These representations build on the information submitted to the Call for Sites consultation.  
1.6 This site has been assessed and we consider it to remain suitable, available, achievable and viable taking into account relevant policy requirements and obligations.  
1.7 The identification of this site results from a village-wide walk over and assessment of the development potential. The plan in Appendix 2 identifies the site, its location in the village and its surroundings.  
1.8 According to evidence in the Waveney Village Profiles and from our tour of the village Lound benefits from a number of local facilities and services which contribute to its sustainability.  
1.9 The Estate is open to the tenure and mix of housing which could be
delivered in the village. Much depends on the final site selection and local needs but could include bungalows, affordable housing and smaller homes for first time buyers.

1.10 It remains unclear how the District Council will be responding to recent Government guidance on boosting housing supply and recognising the benefits of rural housing. Therefore the recognition of the village’s sustainability credentials is something we will be pursuing through the local plan review.

1.11 In the meantime we invite the District Council to consider the information in this report, the merits of the site to enable the village of Lound it to ‘play its role in delivering sustainable development’1 in Waveney.

2.0 Planning Policy

2.1 The Waveney Core Strategy dated 2009 was an early respondent to the 2004 Planning Act in respect of the adoption of the Local Development Framework in comparison to other Council’s in Suffolk.

2.2 While direct comparisons are difficult it is apparent that other District Council’s direct development to smaller settlements than do Waveney. For example Suffolk Coastal (2013) identify local service centres and ‘other’ villages, St Edmundsbury (2014) identify local service centres and infill villages and Babergh (2014) identify hinterland villages.

2.3 The Waveney Core Strategy predates the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and is becoming increasingly out of step with national planning policy imperatives and recent Government requirements for local plans to be in place by early 2017.

2.4 For example the Framework requires local planning authorities "to boost significantly the supply of housing".

2.5 Also in comparison to other Core Strategies in Suffolk the Waveney LDF gives relatively little attention to the contribution that villages can play in contributing to rural housing supply. A large number of villages, often with access to local services, are relegated to being classified as being in the open countryside where a general safeguarding approach is advocated in the Waveney Core Strategy.

2.6 The PPG provides guidance on rural housing and states (our emphasis in bold):

Rural Housing How should local authorities support sustainable rural communities? Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306

It is important to recognise the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability, and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements. This is clearly
set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in the core planning principles, the section on supporting a prosperous rural economy and the section on housing.

A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities.

Assessing housing need and allocating sites should be considered at a strategic level and through the Local Plan and/or neighbourhood plan process. However, all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.

The National Planning Policy Framework also recognises that different sustainable transport policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.

2.7 The Waveney New Local Plan is at an early stage and it is not yet clear how Waveney District Council will be responding to these national policy imperatives and how this will be reflected in revisions to the settlement hierarchy in the spatial strategy.

2.8 It is not known whether the District Council will refresh their settlement hierarchy and direct a proportionate amount of housing to all sustainable settlements including villages previously overlooked or whether they will abandon the 'blanket approach' of settlement boundaries and allow development where it can be shown to be sustainable and well related to the built form. Much will depend on the responses the Council receives to the Issues and Options consultation.

2.9 In terms of policy guidance on the site assessments below we have had regard to policies of the adopted Core Strategy (2009), the CIL Charging Schedule and the Development Management document (2011); specifically policies DM16 Housing Density, DM17 Housing Type and Mix and DM18 Affordable Housing.

2.10 The Council acknowledges the need to review these policies as part of the new Local Plan as they were based on former national planning policy priorities and predate the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

2.11 These local policy documents are adopted and, as the Council acknowledges, form a useful baseline now and we have had regard to them in the same manner.

2.12 The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) seeks to
deliver sustainable development. We consider that the assessment below shows that the residential development of the site we have submitted will meet the social, environmental and economic tests for sustainable development.

3.0 The Village of Lound

Geography

3.1 Lound is located in the north of Waveney District and is 6 miles from the large town of Lowestoft, 8 miles from Great Yarmouth and 2 miles from the large village of Blundeston.

3.2 Lound has a population of 359 people and 154 dwellings. The demographic displays a near even gender distribution and an average age slightly higher than the average for Suffolk and the East of England.

Key Facilities

3.3 The Waveney District Council Village Profile (Appendix 3) for Lound lists the key facilities which contribute to the sustainability of the village.

3.4 The nearby villages of Blundeston and Somerleyton have additional key facilities accessible to Lound including a rail station, post office, food shop and primary schools.

3.5 The key facilities in Lound include a public house and meeting place. There is also a café and bakery in the former Post Office as shown on the plan in Appendix 2.

4.0 Site Option 75 Land North of the Snakes Lane, Lound

Site Description and Development Potential

4.1 The site is located in the north of the village and adjacent to the village pub and opposite the duck pond. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 2.

4.2 The site is 0.41ha in size and is well related to the built form of the village. According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 12 dwellings on this site. The density of nearby development suggests this would be a maximum figure including up to 4 affordable homes arranged in a manner sympathetic to the form and position of the site within the village.

4.3 The site is a regular square shape and is generally flat and level and access would either be via Snake's Lane or off The Street.

4.4 To the north of the site is Mardle House and Mardle Farm. Mardle House is 50m north and is a Grade 2 listed building visually separated from the site by substantial boundary vegetation.

To the west and southwest is agricultural land. To the east is the village duck pond and residential land beyond. To the south is the village pub and dwellings on The Street.

4.5 The site has a significant frontage onto The Street and an existing access
with good visibility in each direction from Snake's Lane.

Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal

4.6 The site sustainability appraisal (SSA) at Point 11 states that "use of grade 1 greenfield site" and it is scored -. We disagree with this assessment. The site is small and as can be seen from historic aerial photographs has not be actively farmed since at least 1999:

4.7 We suggest the effect here should be raised to 0 (neutral) effect to reflect circumstances on the ground.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 This report promotes a site in Lound in response to the new Local Plan Issues and Options consultation.

5.2 Lound is a part of a group of villages that benefit from a range of facilities where development in one can support services and facilities in another.

5.3 There is a pressing need to deliver a significant boost in housing supply nationally and Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that rural areas can play their part.

5.4 We have reviewed national and local planning policy and guidance and have visited the site and toured the area. We have submitted this site because it meets the consultation threshold and the criteria set out in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment consultation methodology (Oct 2015).

5.5 Our site assessment shows that the site is currently suitable, available and achievable and that an allocation for development would meet the economic, social and environmental principle of sustainable development in Waveney.

5.6 The site has the ability to provide for a mix of housing types to meet the needs set out in the Waveney Housing Market Assessment and evidenced local need.

Site map and Lound village profile attached.
Potential land for development 76 - Land north of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton

Environment Agency

Section
Potential land for development 76 - Land north of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton

Comment ID
1156

Comment
We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:

Source Protection Zone 1

*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Halesworth Town Council N Rees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 76 - Land north of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton

Comment ID 749

Comment Based on aerial photographs, sites 14; 76; 86; and 160 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 76 - Land north of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This seems to be a good site for industrial use with good road access onto Sparrowhawk Road. It would be a natural contender for a household recycling centre, close to the proposed industrial site102.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tony Langford

**Section** | Potential land for development 76 - Land north of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton

**Comment ID** | 33

**Comment** | Ideal site for offices or industry - something we need in Halesworth
Potential land for development 77 - Land off Benacre Road (Site 1), Ellough

Beccles Town Council C Boyne

Section Potential land for development 77 - Land off Benacre Road (Site 1), Ellough

Comment ID 780

Comment Beccles Town Council would back sites 61, 77 and 78 for future employment bearing in mind the access provision mentioned above and suitable power supplies which are not available at the moment.

[The road infrastructure in the area is very poor and not fit for purpose, the B1127 being a prime example as it is little more than a country lane, as is Ellough Road and most of the others. There is inadequate pedestrian and cycle access to the existing and proposed employment areas at Ellough and no bus service at all.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 77 - Land off Benacre Road (Site 1), Ellough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The county council welcomes the reference to the Beccles South Relief Road and encourages the district authority to mark the route on the Beccles site map. Subject to any further assessments, the proposed level of growth around Beccles is generally acceptable with the exception of the following sites 124, 50, 71, and 77 since these are all further out from the town centre and less likely to encourage sustainable travel choices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential land for development 78 - Land off Benacre Road (Site 2), Ellough

**Beccles Town Council C Boyne**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 78 - Land off Benacre Road (Site 2), Ellough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Beccles Town Council would back sites 61, 77 and 78 for future employment bearing in mind the access provision mentioned above and suitable power supplies which are not available at the moment. [The road infrastructure in the area is very poor and not fit for purpose, the B1127 being a prime example as it is little more than a country lane, as is Ellough Road and most of the others. There is inadequate pedestrian and cycle access to the existing and proposed employment areas at Ellough and no bus service at all.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 79 - Land off Blocka Road, Ashby Dell, Ashby

Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council S H Read

Section | Potential land for development 79 - Land off Blocka Road, Ashby Dell, Ashby

Comment ID | 695

Comment | This site is not suitable for housing development because it would be unsuitable as there are no facilities or supporting infrastructure and it would overwhelm the existing widely-spaced housing in Ashby Dell.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 79 - Land off Blocka Road, Ashby Dell, Ashby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>6, 7, 8 and 9 The Dell to south west - all grade II Listed Buildings. Potential impact upon setting of listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Douch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 79 - Land off Blocka Road, Ashby Dell, Ashby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Anything more than a very small development of 2-4 houses does not seem desirable in this wooded location with poor access &amp; infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Somerleyton Estate Lord Somerleyton
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 79 - Land off Blocka Road, Ashby Dell, Ashby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | 1.0 Introduction 
1.1 Waveney District Council is responsible for setting the amount of housing and employment land is required in Waveney in the future. They are in the early stages of preparing a new local plan which will determine the number and location of new housing and employment sites in the District for the period up to 2036. 
1.2 Evolution Town Planning have been instructed by the Somerleyton Estate to make representations to this public consultation. This is an early stage in the process whereby the Council allocates sites for housing and employment development. 
1.3 This report includes commentary on the Site Option 79 in Ashby Dell. Our responses to the consultation Questions have been submitted under separate cover on the District Council's proforma and a copy is provided here in Appendix 1. 
1.4 Evolution Town Planning (ETP) are experienced in promoting rural sites either through development plan representations or planning applications. We also have site assessment experience from working in Council planning departments. As a practice we have 30 years of combined professional experience in this type of work. 
1.5 These representations include a potential housing site in Ashby Dell. The site is north of Blocka Road and adjacent to Ashby Hall Farm. These representations build on the information submitted to the Call for Sites consultation. 
1.6 This site has been assessed and we consider it remains suitable, available, achievable and viable taking into account relevant policy requirements and obligations. 
1.7 The plan in Appendix 2 identifies the site, its location and its surroundings. 
1.8 According to evidence in the Waveney Village Profiles and from our tour of the area Ashby Dell benefits from being within short travel time of a number of local facilities and services in nearby villages which contribute to its sustainability. 
1.9 The Estate is open to the tenure and mix of housing which could be
delivered at this site. Much depends on the final site selection and local needs but could include bungalows, affordable housing and smaller homes for first time buyers.

1.10 It remains unclear how the District Council will be responding to recent Government guidance on boosting housing supply and recognising the benefits of rural housing. Therefore the recognition of the village’s sustainability credentials is something we will be pursuing through the local plan review.

1.11 In the meantime we invite the District Council to consider the information in this report, the merits of the site to enable Ashby Dell it to 'play its role in delivering sustainable development' 1 in Waveney.

2.0 Planning Policy

2.1 The Waveney Core Strategy dated 2009 was an early respondent to the 2004 Planning Act in respect of the adoption of the Local Development Framework in comparison to other Council's in Suffolk.

2.2 While direct comparisons are difficult it is apparent that other District Council's direct development to smaller settlements than do Waveney. For example Suffolk Coastal (2013) identify local service centres and 'other' villages, St Edmundsburry (2014) identify local service centres and infill villages and Babergh (2014) identify hinterland villages.

2.3 The Waveney Core Strategy predates the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and is becoming increasingly out of step with national planning policy imperatives and recent Government requirements for local plans to be in place by early 2017.

2.4 For example the Framework requires local planning authorities "to boost significantly the supply of housing".

2.5 Also in comparison to other Core Strategies in Suffolk the Waveney LDF gives relatively little attention to the contribution that villages can play in contributing to rural housing supply. A large number of villages, often with access to local services, are relegated to being classified as being in the open countryside where a general safeguarding approach is advocated in the Waveney Core Strategy.

2.6 The PPG provides guidance on rural housing and states (our emphasis in bold):

Rural Housing How should local authorities support sustainable rural communities?

Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306

It is important to recognise the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability, and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements. This is clearly
set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in the core planning principles, the section on supporting a prosperous rural economy and the section on housing.

A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities.

Assessing housing need and allocating sites should be considered at a strategic level and through the Local Plan and/or neighbourhood plan process. However, all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.

The National Planning Policy Framework also recognises that different sustainable transport policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.

2.7 The Waveney New Local Plan is at an early stage and it is not yet clear how Waveney District Council will be responding to these national policy imperatives and how this will be reflected in revisions to the settlement hierarchy in the spatial strategy.

2.8 It is not known whether the District Council will refresh their settlement hierarchy and direct a proportionate amount of housing to all settlements including villages previously overlooked or whether they will abandon the ‘blanket approach’ of settlement boundaries and allow development where it can be shown to be sustainable and well related to the built form. Much will depend on the responses the Council receives to the Issues and Options consultation.

2.9 In terms of policy guidance on the site assessments below we have had regard to policies of the adopted Core Strategy (2009), the CIL Charging Schedule and the Development Management document (2011); specifically policies DM16 Housing Density, DM17 Housing Type and Mix and DM18 Affordable Housing.

2.10 The Council acknowledges the need to review these policies as part of the new Local Plan as they were based on former national planning policy priorities and predate the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

2.11 These local policy documents are adopted and, as the Council acknowledges, form a useful baseline now and we have had regard to them in the same manner.

2.12 The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) seeks to
Options for the new Waveney Local Plan | Consultation responses

deliver sustainable development. We consider that the assessment below shows that the residential development of the site we have submitted will meet the social, environmental and economic tests for sustainable development.

3.0 Ashby Dell
Geography
3.1 Ashby Dell is located in the north of Waveney District and is 7.4 miles from the large town of Lowestoft, 7.5 miles from Great Yarmouth, 2 miles from Somerleyton, 1.9 miles to Lound and 3.2 miles from the large village of Blundeston.
3.2 Ashby Dell, along with Somerleyton and Herringfleet, is part of the parish of Somerleyton which has a population of 427 people and 154 dwellings. The demographic displays a near even gender distribution and an average age slightly higher than the average for Suffolk and the East of England.

Key Facilities
3.3 The Waveney District Council Village Profile (Appendix 3) for Ashby (with Somerleyton and Herringfleet) lists the key facilities which contribute to the sustainability of the area.
3.4 The nearby villages of Somerleyton, Blundeston and Lound have additional key facilities accessible to Ashby Dell including a rail station, post office, food shop and primary schools.

4.0 Site Option 79 Land North of the Blocka Road, Ashby Dell
Site Description and Development Potential
4.1 The site is located north of Blocka Road in Ashby Dell. It is adjacent to dwellings associated with the Somerleyton Estate, Ashby Rectory, The Lodge and Ashby Hall Farm. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 2.
4.2 The site is 0.5ha in size and is well related to existing dwellings within the hamlet. According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 15 dwellings on this site. The density of nearby development suggests a figure of 5 or 6 dwellings would be appropriate including up to 2 affordable homes arranged in a manner sympathetic to the form and position of the site.
4.3 To the south of the site are 7 Estate dwellings all accessed off the same driveway. No.s 6, 7, 8 and 9 The Dell are Grade 2 listed buildings. To the west and north is agricultural land.

5.0 Conclusion
5.1 This report promotes a site in Ashby Dell in response to the new Local Plan Issues and Options consultation.
5.2 Ashby Dell is part of a group of villages that benefit from a range of facilities where development in one can support services and facilities in
another.

5.3 There is a pressing need to deliver a significant boost in housing supply nationally and Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that rural areas can play their part.

5.4 We have reviewed national and local planning policy and guidance and have visited the site and toured the area. We have submitted this site because it meets the consultation threshold and the criteria set out in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment consultation methodology (Oct 2015).

5.5 Our site assessment shows that the site remains suitable, available and achievable and that an allocation for development would meet the economic, social and environmental principle of sustainable development in Waveney.

5.6 The site has the ability to provide for a mix of housing types to meet the needs set out in the Waveney Housing Market Assessment and evidenced local need.

Location map and Village profile attached.
Potential land for development 80 - Land off Church Lane, Carlton Colville

Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd Edward Gilder

Comment ID 1127

Comment
We have already placed before you the virtues of each of the sites which we have submitted and make the point that, in the event of allocation, we are in a position to bring each forward for development within the early years of the plan.

Each is well located in relation to existing built development and can proceed without reliance on others.

Site 80 at Carlton Colville provides an opportunity to draw traffic away from the tight corner by the church and provide a more direct link from Chapel Road to Church Lane. It rounds off the extent of development of Carlton Colville, to the west and does not extend into open countryside.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 80 - Land off Church Lane, Carlton Colville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Area 80 open land should be preserved because it provides a green corridor and views of the church. It is also one of the highest points in Carlton Colville and housing there would have a detrimental affect on drains and sewers. The church also needs a parking area and extra burial area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 80 - Land off Church Lane, Carlton Colville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Church of St Peter, grade II* to north eats. Potential impact upon setting of high grade listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michael Leedham

Section  Potential land for development 80 - Land off Church Lane, Carlton Colville

Comment ID  62

Comment  This site has been proposed on numerous occasions before and has always been turned down for very good reasons.
My serious objection to this site is as follows:
The site is surrounded by dangerous blind corners, from Carlton Manor there is a blind left hand bend, another blind corner at the church which has regular accidents. There is also the access road from Carlton Hall Residential Home yet another hazard.
Roads from Waters Avenue and Beaumont Road and further on another dangerous junction at the access to Mutfordwood Lane again a very narrow road.
I believe this development would cause traffic chaos apart from which the level from this site is such that any housing would cut off light and privacy for all of the homes along the stretch of road opposite. If the site is developed there would be a huge flooding problem as the water would run downhill from Waters Ave and Beaumont Road towards The Mardle where there have already been serious flooding problems.
Another major objection to this piece of land being developed is that the relatively small number of houses will do nothing significant to solve the housing problem but will effectively surround Carlton Colville Village from all sides by development and block views of the beautiful 14th Century St Peters Church which is the first view many people get from Carlton Colville as they come in from the west.
If this development is allowed I believe it will give the green light for development through to Mutfordwood and beyond effectively joining Hulver and beyond.
I consider this proposal to be very seriously flawed.
If Carlton Colville old village needs any further development I would suggest that the old school which is currently much underused could be sympathetically developed for first time buyers and or retirement bungalows without having any major impact on the character of the old village as all major services i.e gas, water and electricity are already in place.
There are buzzards nesting in Mutford Wood together with owls and sparrow hawks in the trees near to Carlton Manor and Carlton Hall and the development of this land would seriously diminish their prospects for
survival.
Finally if the owner of the land would consider donating a strip of the field free of charge to the church for parking without the 60 houses this would be the best outcome for the church and the village.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mr &amp; Mrs W Deal</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 80 - Land off Church Lane, Carlton Colville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>A development on this site would cause further problems relating to flooding, highway congestion/ parking &amp; put strain on the local school. A small area in the eastern site section for Church parking would however relieve local parking congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norman Castleton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential land for development 80 - Land off Church Lane, Carlton Colville</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Far too much development in the area already. Any more will add to the overstretched services and communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 81 - Land off Darby Road, Chenery's Farm, Beccles / Weston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The corridor adjacent to the Beccles Relief Road should only be developed for housing on a limited scale ie. not all the sites listed should be identified for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charlotte Sanderson

Section  Potential land for development 81 - Land off Darby Road, Chenery's Farm, Beccles / Weston

Comment ID  608

Comment  493 houses - the scale of this development is far too big for Beccles. Where will the occupants work? Many will rely on their cars this will add to congestion, parking problems and pollution in the area. Developments of this scale will also alter the character of Beccles.
Nicky Elliott

Section Potential land for development 81 - Land off Darby Road, Chenery's Farm, Beccles / Weston

Comment ID 464

Comment I think this site, along with sites 8 and 9, provide the best location for the required development in Beccles, provided that access for motor vehicles is made from the Southern Relief road only. Vehicles will be able to enter and leave the development from the east and west on the Southern Relief Road, and then north and south on A roads. Other residential roads adjacent to these lands (Darby Road, Nicholson Drive and Cucumber Lane) should provide cycle and pedestrian access only. If the three sites were developed together, the developer could be required to provide some infrastructure such as a community centre, shops, school, health centre, pub, etc.
Rachael Staniul

Section  
Potential land for development 81 - Land off Darby Road, Chenery's Farm, Beccles / Weston

Comment ID  883

Comment  
The proposed 493 houses is far too many. Any more development in this area will put more pressure on the main rain water culvert, which runs from M & H Plastics, to Common Lane and beyond. This culvert passes behind my property in Kilbrack and is already unfit for purpose, and to put extra stress on it could result in properties being flooded. Anglian Water had indicated a few years ago that due to extra impact during heavy rain, the culvert would need to be heightened. No such work has been undertaken, and residents, such as myself, whose properties are in close proximity to this are very worried what effect the pressure of so many new houses would have. If this proposal is given permission for almost 500 houses, would the heightening work on the rainwater culvert be carried out as a matter of urgency?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosemary Shaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 81 - Land off Darby Road, Chenery's Farm, Beccles / Weston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Sites 8; 9; 44; 60; 62; 81; 82 and 89 form a large block of land which is likely to be of some value, particularly for farmland species. Careful consideration should therefore be given to the allocation of these sites for residential development, in order to ensure that it does not result in an adverse impact on the wildlife value of the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Susan Doherty

Section  Potential land for development 81 - Land off Darby Road, Chenery's Farm, Beccles / Weston

Comment ID  933

Comment  Over development, flooding, the main storm drain for Beccles runs through this area, this is already too small to take water in heavy rain, Anglian Water need to build up this drain all the way to St. Anne's Road, Kilbrack, Gosford Road and beyond, before any more pressure is put on this already fragile infrastructure, which was last heightened as long ago as the 1960s!
## Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

**Section**  
Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

**Comment ID**  
634

**Comment**  
This proposed development is too large for the village of Worlingham and would strain the resources in Beccles in respect of health care. I suggest that this space is better used for a commercial activity such as a premier inn and associated pub. This would meet the local demand for overnight accommodation, provide much needed service jobs and give the village a local pub again.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The corridor adjacent to the Beccles Relief Road should only be developed for housing on a limited scale ie. not all the sites listed should be identified for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beccles Town Council C Boyne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Beccles Town Council rejects the Lark Fleet proposal area 82 based on its location to industrial areas, noise and air pollution and also the huge increase in traffic that it would bring down the Ellough Road into Beccles via the Ingate bottleneck. Any infrastructure added to site 82 would not be sufficient to cover the needs of residents and prevent the necessity to enter Beccles town centre. The development of site 82 was considered to be completely inappropriate and would be a disaster for the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charlotte Sanderson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Totally out of scale for a rural town, where will the occupants of 950 new houses work? This will substantially increase pressure on local roads, water and wildlife resources. Pollution will increase for all of the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citrus Sharp Security Shredding Jules Shorrock

Section Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID 118

Comment Having attended Larkfleet Homes PR Event I was not surprised at the high number of complainants, concerned about pressures on local resources & the danger of adding traffic onto Ellough Road & over congested A146., Although i share their anxieties, my main concern is commercial. My SME, Citrus security shredding employs 3 good quality staff from Ellough area, we shred confidential data in an enclosed unit within V C Cooke's very secure 20 acre site. Part of the site is also leased to Aquablast who employ c15 staff, often high pressure water jetting in an open sided shedded area 200 yards from the main gates. VC Cooke employs 25 people. This group of businesses would be a huge annoyance to the 975 prospective homeowners if permission was given to Larkwood Home developers, who have paid for the option to develop the field opposite the large waste processing site.

Even if planning permission terms are onerous to the developers, noise pollution carried from a working site on which all moving vehicles & plant have to make very loud warning sounds from early morning & into the weekends, in compliance with Safety Legislation, will make life unpleasant for householders, inevitably creating lots of complaints to woe. VC Cooke have undoubtedly benefited the local economy over the last 50 years, currently employing 25 people. The business has achieved industry accolades for good environmental practice & won EDP Community Impact Award in 2011. Citrus & Aquablast have also been recognised for positive environmental impacts. Regrettably I think that this could be the death knell of established & well thought of businesses, operating independently without subsidies employing hundreds of unqualified and unskilled people, even now supporting several illiterate family bread winners. All staff have benefited from regular training & many have progressed onto better things. Waste handling & recycling sites are in decline, this site exceeds onerous Waste management legislative requirements. VCC run a tight ship, steering through rough waters to stay afloat, attracting custom from Biffa, Veolia, WDC, Hales, East coast waste, the Latitude festival organisers, Leisten skip hire, c100 builders & tradesmen hiring over 3500 skips pa & reducing landfill outcome for 400 mixed waste for commercial businesses.
Stringent licensing means that Waste sites are not easy to re-locate, the cost would be huge & expansion of residents into brown field developments now encroaching on industrial zones forces the Director’s to question the value of re-locating at all & probably not a battle that can be won in the face of the economics of devolution. I fear that WDC could be swayed by the benefit of EDF committing to extend the short electricity supply into the 975 new home development, & as WDC may well need this new homes bonus incentive to function, the proposed development could well outweigh the interests of the employees and VC Cooke & Aquablasts annual business rates contributions. What a sad state of affairs that this prominent established & efficient business could well be seriously threatened by encroaching houses that should be located in a more suitable location with a far better chance of growing into a community if it was built away from a competing industrial growth area in Ellough, currently designated as a business Enterprise zone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Caroline Topping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Edward Wilkinson

Section
Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID
5

Comment
I have serious concerns that Worlingham can sustain this number of housing developments and the current infrastructure and road systems. There are already traffic problems in and around the Worlingham/Beccles area, and serious difficulties around the NHS facilities currently available in this area.
Graham Jenkins

Section
Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID
73

Comment
The Developer has proposed to build 975 houses on this site. I want to voice my objection to this proposal on the grounds that such a project will swamp the local facilities. Currently the small market town of Beccles and Worlingham village is struggling to cope with existing population. The infrastructure needs a complete overhaul before plot 82 is agreed as the Developer has not guaranteed the provision of extra schools, doctors surgeries, dentists and sewerage disposal facilities. Also there is currently problems relating to traffic congestion in Beccles and parking at Tesco supermarket. Finally I am not against the building of extra houses in the area shown on the map but there is a need to moderate the demands of land owners and developers so that the quality of life for existing residents and newcomers is not put in jeopardy.
Jay

Section Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID 423

Comment Traffic
Ellough road is currently very busy at peak times – this will only get worse with 1,000+ cars added at these times. As there are two schools located on, or just off, this road this could become quite dangerous at peak hours.

Local Facilities
Schools, Doctors and Dentists would have to be able to cope with approx 3,000+ extra people. As these facilities are all currently stretched, can they cope with this increase and are finances available for this extra demand.

Flooding/Water
Once housing is built any excess water will run downhill along Ellough Road will be likely to pool at the junction with Hillside avenue and increase the chance of flooding to the properties there.

Proposed Public Facilities
A school, medical centre & sports pitches have been suggested by the developers but these would all be in fairly close proximity to the industrial estate from where chemical fumes etc can travel across.

Employment
Large increase in population but no prospects of commensurate extra local employment. Will Beccles become just a dormitory for Norwich?
Jill Sharp

Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID 22

Comment
Site No.82 is NOT suitable to build on as 950 houses takes up a lot of clay land off this site. The clay absorbs the rainfall and prevents flooding to other surrounding areas.

1. V.C Cooke re-cycling depot creates air pollution (Worlingham Wiff) over this land and is a Heath Hazard to house residents, as acculates and then is contained within the housing properties. This Air Pollution is detrimental to bronchial suffers of the young and elderly (eg Asmathics).

2. V.C Cooke re-cycling depot creates, noise pollution and is a nuisance for the residents at the top and half way up Bluebell Way Now!!!. The residents of the houses built on that site will suffer more intolerable sound of the re-cycling machinery. This is not conducive to the mental wellbeing of residents, and when the "Relief road " is built this will increase the noise pollution. This would not respect the duty of care for residents.

3. The amount of houses to be built is extreme and the financial infrastructure of Beccles and Worlingham would collapse. The medical Centre is already struggling as confirmed by staff there. The road system is already congested and the extra cost for WDC would be expensive and use the funds up that could of be used for other house develops less expensive.

4. Anglia Water sewerage. System is already over load.!!2006-2007 mention could cope with only another 600 dwellings.

5. This site was turned down last time as greenfield and not to WDC strategy of future housing development care.

6. The land is not stable to build on, as inland fill in 1982 due to previously used as clay and gravel pits and for War World 11 munitions dumping and is referred to in ordinance maps and documents that WDC Enviromental Health Dept have.

7. Worlingham Village would no longer exists but be a suburb of Beccles.
John Cakebread

Section Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID 196

Comment

I attended the exhibition at Beccles Public Hall. I have 2 main real concerns:
1 Water drainage
2 Privacy

Water drainage

My property falls below the elevation of the proposed development. In heavy rain my garden is often waterlogged. I put this to Mark Mann, Planning Director Larkfleet Homes, who was in charge at the exhibition, that 975 houses with tarmac roads and pavements on higher ground, surely can only worsen matters. My property is in the firing line. He assured me that drainage would be improved with water diverted to 2 ponds and my garden would in future, not be subject to excess water or in extreme weather conditions, flooding. When I asked if he would offer a written guarantee, he replied 'no, of course not.' This is pure meaningless rhetoric. Words are cheap. Should I experience later flooding problems, my only recourse is to Insurance policies. Anyone else would not care less in the slightest. Mr Mann said his office had been in consultation with Waveney District Council, but he did not know who the Council Point of Contact was. I gave him my number and he said he would 'most certainly' find out and phone me. One week on, I have heard nothing.

Privacy

My property is a single storey dwelling. When I spoke with the Waveney Planning Officer, he mentioned that privacy is a material consideration and planning allows for a 35 metre separation from a primary window. Mr Mann said that his masterplan would cater for 21 metre separation and a 2 storey building could well be built on the back of my garden. I feel this is totally unacceptable. DM02 Principles state that developments should include a mix of small and large houses with bungalows. Because my property is below the proposed development, a new 2 storey building would seriously compromise my privacy. Soft landscaping with trees was brought up with Mr Mann. He did not have details of how many trees, what type or whether the trees would be in the gardens or in a separate strip maintained by the Council. It was not included in the masterplan. I am fully aware of the possibility of community edges being extended. Yet it should be planned with respect and consideration to the existing
environment. District HMA suggests that new developments must be 'sensitive to its location.' As Cllr Colin Law has stated in a recent publication delivered to all Council residents, "the best way to do this (improve the quality of life for the people living and working in Waveney) ... by giving our communities the power to make important decisions for themselves."

Whether the locality has the jobs or infrastructure to support such a large housing development, is another matter. My immediate concerns of water drainage and privacy were not at all convincingly answered by Larkfleet Homes. With respect, I trust that there are sufficient, adequate checks and monitoring to be applied in the planning process.
Marya Parker

Section: Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID: 19

Comment: Collectively, the number of sites and indicative house numbers on the south side of Beccles amounts to some 3,500 homes - a sizeable settlement. There needs to be accompanying provision of additional green space, formal and informal, health services, school and a community centre or hall before any sites are developed, where this would not be a requirement for any one site piecemeal development would result in an unsupportable burden on existing facilities. The increased traffic along London Road and Hungate - especially as there is no south western link to the A146, would also be unacceptable. The Town Centre would become a very unattractive place for shoppers and visitors and would require significant additional town centre parking.

.

.
McGregor

Section | Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID | 491

Comment | This site seems almost too good to fit in with the growth plan. Once the relief road is in place the site would have direct car access onto it. Also construction vehicles could use it for access with virtually zero impact on the town.

The site offers the space for the significant amount of housing required in the plan.

As a new development it would have full infrastructure in place such as schools and medical centre and recreation thus having a minimal impact on existing.

There will be easy access to the town via existing roads to the north of the site for pedestrians and cycles

The site is currently of no great consequence to Beccles therefore having little environmental or visual impact. In fact if landscaped and modelled well it would be a boon to the town.
Paul Gurbutt

Section  Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID  131

Comment  1. How do you protect the historic heart of Beccles from the increased traffic. All the developments are south of Worlingham and all the supermarkets are to the north (*) traffic blocking Beccles. The secondary schools locations (*) that cross Beccles traffic is inevitable. Larkfleet (area 82) gave no assurance of any solution to the traffic problem.
2. How do you plan for extra infrastructure? I have heard from Anglian Water that the sewage treatment works is already over stretched, without 100's more houses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul Leman</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jonathan Blankley

Section Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID 111

Comment If this area is developed, then southern development of the town has to stop there. Given its size the mix would have to reflect the needs of the existing community for smaller starter and retirement properties alongside larger family homes. The aim should be to address local needs rather than attract even more people into the area. There should also be significant green spaces alongside leisure and sports facilities. A small retail/commercial area that complimented the existing town centre would need to be considered One that would improve the facilities for Worlingham, alongside consideration for a small park and ride to link the area with the centre of town. Even with the building of the southern relief road, the increased traffic into town would be significant, especially with regard to the school run, and plans would need to be included to cope with this.
Rachael Staniul

Section  Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID  878

Comment  Too many proposed houses – overdevelopment, unfortunately, the infrastructure in and around Beccles is struggling to cope now. We are told that the GPs at Beccles surgery have patient lists in excess of 2000 people per doctor. Where are almost 1000 new households going to find a GP, access to wider healthcare, and dental treatment etc. My husband and myself have to travel out of the Beccles area for dental treatment as it is. You cannot build houses on this scale without serious thought and consultation as to how already struggling services are supposed to support it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark Beglarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosemary Shaw

Section  Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID  560

Comment  The most suitable sites for development are those which would be served by the new road to the south, namely site numbers 8, 9, 81, 82 and 107 - and this would also apply to sites like number 124. It would make sense if these sites (8, 9, 81, 82, 107) had good cycle paths and walkways into the centre of Beccles even though they would primarily be served by the new southern relief/distributor road for motor vehicles.
Rosemary Simpson

Section  Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID  486

Comment  This and adjacent sites have more potential and my preference for reasons as follows; it offers direct vehicle access onto the southern relief road. People wanting to travel to Norwich and Lowestoft and local super markets have direct access to major routes thus relieving town congestion. This must be a bonus. Also I would propose cycle and pedestrian access routes feeding from the north of this development, thus also relieving the need to use a car. It has less impact on the environment (not many existing trees etc). The opportunity for new schools and small shops. Which will be needed within the site. Let's hope green space is also allocated.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section
Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID 742

Comment
Sites 8; 9; 44; 60; 62; 81; 82 and 89 form a large block of land which is likely to be of some value, particularly for farmland species. Careful consideration should therefore be given to the allocation of these sites for residential development, in order to ensure that it does not result in an adverse impact on the wildlife value of the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Susan Doherty</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worlingham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group John Coulson

Section  Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID  126

Comment  As a resident of Worlingham my concerns are for the areas listed (82, 62, 60, 44).
Increase in traffic
Will local drainage be able to cope. A recent response to our Neighbourhood Plan group indicates that foul and surface water drainage is already virtually at its limit.
What will WDC do to improve facilities in Worlingham as we currently have no village hall, pub etc.
What will determine the number / rate of housebuilding in Worlingham?
Can you please differentiate between Worlingham and Beccles, they are not the same place!
Will the local plan consider a new doctors surgery in Worlingham.
What is WDC position with the Larkfleet housing proposal. When will you have establish what growth level you will be working with?
How will our neighbourhood plan be able to influence WDC planning?
When do we need to have our neighbourhood plan in place to be considered in WDC planning?
Worlingham Neighbourhood Planning Team Wendy Summerfield  
Wendy Summerfield

Section  
Potential land for development 82 - Land off Ellough Road, Worlingham / Beccles

Comment ID  
951

Comment  
We also feel that area 82, the land proposed for development by Larkfleet Homes off Ellough Road Worlingham is unacceptable as neither the village nor Beccles has the infrastructure, drainage, roads, schools, medical facilities or jobs to accommodate almost 1,000 dwellings.
## Potential land for development 83 - Land off Mill Lane, Barnby

**Barnby Parish Council Ian Hinton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 83 - Land off Mill Lane, Barnby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>At the end of the single-lane loke next to Oak Cottage on Mill Lane – the most difficult site to place new housing – currently farmland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beccles and Bungay Cycle Strategy Ian Reid

Section  Potential land for development 83 - Land off Mill Lane, Barnby

Comment ID  556

Comment  A corridor for wildlife and as such development would have a detrimental effect on the environment. Limited to non-existent access to the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Natalie Beal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charles Fortt

Section
Potential land for development 83 - Land off Mill Lane, Barnby

Comment ID
573

Comment
Barnby's housing development must be limited by the nature of the road network into and from Barnby from the A146 and by the access to any site from Mill Lane. The village is not suitable for any but small scale development on small sites with good access/egress onto the A146.
Charlotte Sanderson

Section
Potential land for development 83 - Land off Mill Lane, Barnby

Comment ID
595

Comment
I feel that this development would be inappropriate for a number of reasons:
* This is currently a Greenfield site.
* It is outside the village envelope.
* The development of 11 homes would change the very rural nature of this end of the village, and would lead to the suburbanisation of the area.
* I feel that this development would set an unacceptable precedent.
* 11 homes would place pressure on the struggling existing sewage infrastructure.
* This area drains directly into the Hundred Drain and so into a SSSI and NNR. The increased run-off (likely to be contaminated with phosphates, nitrates and plastics) from these houses, patios, drives and roadways, should be a concern.
* Barnby has no village shop, few places of employment, and no surgery. The school is full.
* The occupants of the new development would be reliant on their car, which is not sustainable. It is my view that this development is likely to add a further 22 cars regularly using Mill Lane and Swan Lane (and add a likely 66 extra vehicle movements a day).
* There would be greater likelihood of collisions, particularly close to the junction with Mill Lane and the Garden Centre.
* The "soundscape" of this part of the village is likely to change in character. Other than the noise of the A146, it is quite quiet. You can hear farm animals and wildlife. This is an important feature of the villages "breathing space". It is likely that a suburban housing development would add lawnmowers, radios and voices, and so change peoples experience on the nearby public footpath.
* The rural character of the night sky would change, with the addition of security lights and potentially street lights.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Potential land for development 83 - Land off Mill Lane, Barnby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Wade Hall grade II to north and Wade Hall Moated Site Scheduled Monument. Potential impact upon the setting of the Listed Building and Scheduled Monument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ian Anthony Lowe**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 83 - Land off Mill Lane, Barnby

**Comment ID**  
1205

**Comment**  
I have now reconsidered and no longer wish to offer this site as a proposed plot for the local plan at this time. Please remove this plot from the web site and any literature. Sorry for any inconvenience.
Julie Reid

Section Potential land for development 83 - Land off Mill Lane, Barnby

Comment ID 488

Comment
This land is a corridor for wildlife, and would have a detrimental impact on the environment.
The position of this site has limited to non-existant access.
| North Cove Parish Council Jayne Evans |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Section         | Potential land for development 83 - Land off Mill Lane, Barnby |
| Comment ID      | 575                         |
| Comment         | Terrible access potential to increase flooding around The Drain |
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 83 - Land off Mill Lane, Barnby

Comment ID 760

Comment Based on aerial photographs, site 83 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that this site should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that it may have.
Potential land for development 84 - Land off Parkhill, Oulton

Oldman Homes Philip Oldman
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section
Potential land for development 84 - Land off Parkhill, Oulton

Comment ID
684

Comment
1.0 The "Initial sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" is encouraging in that there are several positive points:
- Improving health and wellbeing
- Improvement to access to key services
- Meeting housing requirements
- Encouraging efficient patterns of movement

Whilst the only negative points identified relate to:
(a) Conserving Natural Resources
(b) To reduce contribution to climate change and mitigate effects"

With regard to (a) & (b) it is inevitable that there will be negative issues around these based on potential use of greenfield land, but this situation applies to the vast majority of sites being promoted through the overall land bid exercise.

2.0 The site offer potentially 42 dwellings (LPA estimate) and although largely a greenfield site it is located immediately adjacent to the built up area in Oulton at the northern end of Lowestoft. In any event within the present search for sites, the LPA has also recognised that greenfield development is inevitable. This is particularly the case given the lack of progress with regard to delivery of significant amounts of residential development around the Lake Lothing area which is largely brownfield in character.

3.0 As stated above, the site is adjacent to existing housing to the south and also the north east and south east on the opposite side of Parkhill. It could be built out as a "stand alone" site but there is also scope to look at a consolidated approach with land to the west which is also included in this exercise but is in separate ownership. This potential allocation involves several parcels of land identified as Sites 17,170 and 171 which cover a brownfield site covering the remains of the former Lothingland Hospital.

Although not necessary the owners of Site 84 would be prepared to adopt a
options for the new Waveney local plan | consultation responses

Consolidation approach utilising these areas. Not only would this deliver more housing and therefore more efficient use of land but it would also facilitate a much improved access onto Parkhill via Site 84, thus avoiding what is at present a most unsatisfactory cross road arrangement at the intersection of Union Lane, Parkhill and Oulton Rd Nth.

4.0 Turning to Site 17 in particular, Oldman Homes Limited have a legal option to purchase this site as the owner wishes to provide a sustainable development accessed via Site 84 onto the B1375 thus avoiding the need to use Union Lane for access to through traffic.

5.0 In consideration of the overall approach outlined above, there may also be scope to utilise Union Lane as an emergency or restricted access to serve the wider development.

6.0 In consideration of the sites within the confines of the former hospital i.e. Sites 17, 170 and 171 there is further scope to consider the possibility of linking with Sites 168 and 169 to the south of Union Lane.

7.0 By adopting a consolidatory approach, this would also enable an element of strategic landscaping adjacent to Parkhill, thus creating an attractive entrance to the town when arriving from the north. Site 84 also has the benefit of direct access onto Parkhill which is less intensively used now that the Northern Spine Road has been completed and is in operation to the east.

8.0 Furthermore, again although not essential, there is also scope to include Site 172 immediately adjacent to Site 84 to the north to promote more housing should the Council wish to pursue this option; otherwise it would appear unlikely that Site 172 could be allocated in isolation being detached from the built up area.

9.0 The Council predicts that at least 7700 new homes will be needed between 2011 and 2036. Indeed the LPA recognises that this figure could be as high as 9500; and therefore there is considerable pressure to release additional housing land. The LPA has also indicated that 630 dwellings have been built throughout the district between 2011 and 2015. This equates to 158 per annum. Taking the lower figure above (7700) the requirement is 308 per annum (over the 25 year period between 2011 & 2036), whilst the highest figure represents the need for 380 per year.

10.0 Notwithstanding the fact that there are planning permissions in place for over 3000 dwellings and a further 633 included in allocated sites, nonetheless as illustrated by the Lake Lothing situation, there is some doubt over the ability to deliver the required housing. The fact that the Council is still seeking further sites at present reinforces this position and it follows that there will be likely to be a significant shortfall; and therefore there is even greater need to promote sites which are available, viable and
11.0 Concentrating on Site 84 on its own merits, it is also understood that there are no viability issues and therefore development could be delivered swiftly, and in so doing help to contribute towards the required 5YHLS, with the support of the LPA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**                          | Sites not suitable for development:  
84 Land off Parkhill  
We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure. |
Suffolk Wildlife Trust  
James Meyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 84 - Land off Parkhill, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Based on aerial photographs, sites 54; 84; and 129 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 85 - Land off Rider Haggard Lane, Kessingland

Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Potential land for development 85 - Land off Rider Haggard Lane, Kessingland

Comment ID 986

Comment With regards to site 85 (Rider Haggard Lane), site 109 (London Road) and sites 119 and 125 (Church Road) – none of the landowners came forward during the 4 years that the Neighbourhood Plan has been in progress, except the owner of sites 119 and 125 (part of these sites are being used as allotments), who stated that they didn’t want to be part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. These two sites which are south of Church Road are part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) bordering the Kessingland Levels, and are not sites suitable for development.

Excluding site 41, which has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan, these 4 sites in total would bring forward 100 homes.

The Neighbourhood Plan, which is as a result of 4 years consultation with landowners and the local community brings forward 3 sites which would bring forward a total of 105 homes plus in the case of site SA1 a commercial incubator facility, in respect of site SA2 a new playing field recreation area extension and in the case of SA3 affordable homes held in perpetuity for the residents of Kessingland.

Therefore the 4 sites put forward in the Waveney Local Plan are considered to be surplus to the requirements of Kessingland, the 'Housing Needs Survey' figures are more than covered by the Neighbourhood Plan proposals, which should be included in the Waveney Local Plan in preference to the other sites put forward.
**Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 85 - Land off Rider Haggard Lane, Kessingland

**Comment ID**  
764

**Comment**  
Based on aerial photographs, sites 41; 85; 109 and 119 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section
Potential land for development 85 - Land off Rider Haggard Lane, Kessingland

Comment ID
713

Comment
1.0 The "Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" is encouraging in that the only negative points identified relate to:
(a) "Conserving and enhancing the quality and distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes"
(b) Conserving natural resources
(c) To reduce contribution to climate change and mitigate effects"
Furthermore the exercise has identified 3 plus points:
- Health and well-being
- Improving access to key services & facilities
- Meeting housing requirements of the whole community and

2.0 The site is identified by the LPA to have the potential for 60 dwellings. Development of this site is considered to be relatively close to a range of facilities.

3.0 With regard to (a) (b) & (c) above, it is inevitable that there will be negative issues around the rural location being a greenfield site but this situation applies to the vast majority of sites being promoted through this land bid exercise. Furthermore, there is sufficient room to include strategic planting to enhance the development and to mitigate the limited impact it may have on the rural hinterland which in any event would be reinforced by existing substantial tree planting along the northern and eastern boundaries, thus mitigating any impact on the Strategic Gap on the north side of Kessingland which in any event is being reduced through the promotion of a site in the Kessingland Neighbourhood Plan (KNP) to the south of Laurel Farm to the north west of Site 85 involving approximately 55 dwellings. The Laurel Farm site is more intrusive in terms of its location within the strategic gap and peculiarly does not appear to be being promoted strategically through this Call for Sites exercise. For your information a separate response will be submitted to the KNP (Reg 16) Submission Consultation Exercise presently underway.

4.0 The Sustainability Appraisal refers to the loss of protected woodland presumably in the corridor at the southern end of the site where access to Rider Haggard Lane would be provided, and is covered by a TPO. However this area does not appear to be identified in the KNP and should the land
bid prove successful then replacement landscaping can be offered through the introduction of a landscaped area within the site comprising commensurate replacement tree planting and other plant species to compensate for the loss of the trees covered by the TPO. The TPO covers two groups comprising 46 Corsican Pine and 7 poplar trees in total, but at a glance do not provide particularly attractive specimens.

5.0 The LPA recognises that the site is in a sustainable location being relatively close to a range of facilities and could assist in providing both much needed affordable and starter homes. The site offer potentially around 60 dwellings (LPA estimate), but a lower density scheme could also be considered to facilitate a higher level of strategic planting; and although a greenfield site, given the present search for sites, the LPA has recognised that greenfield development throughout the district is inevitable. This is particularly the case given the lack of progress with regard to delivery of significant amounts of residential development around the Lake Lothing area within Lowestoft.

6.0 The Council predicts that at least 7700 new homes will be needed up to 2036. Indeed the LPA recognises that this figure could be as high as 9500; and therefore there is considerable pressure to release additional housing land. The LPA has also indicated that 630 dwellings have been built throughout the district between 2011 and 2015. This equates to 158 per annum. Taking the lower figure above (7700) the requirement is 308 per annum (over the 25 year period between 2011 & 2036, whilst the highest figure represents the need for 380 per year.

7.0 Notwithstanding the fact that there are planning permissions in place for over 3000 dwellings and a further 633 included in allocated sites, nonetheless as illustrated by the Lake Lothing situation, there is some doubt over the ability to deliver the required housing. The fact that the Council is still seeking further sites at present reinforces this position and it follows that there will be likely to be a significant shortfall; and therefore there is even greater need to promote sites which are available, viable and deliverable in accordance with Para 47 of the NPPF.

8.0 It is understood that there are no viability issues with this particular site and therefore development could be delivered relatively swiftly, and in so doing help to achieve both the Councils required 5YHLS and its Housing Strategy, if supported by the LPA.
### Potential land for development 86 - Land off Saxons Way, Halesworth

**Halesworth Town Council N Rees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 86 - Land off Saxons Way, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 86 is an unusual shape and would therefore require very sensitive and original ideas to develop in line with surrounding areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section          Potential land for development 86 - Land off Saxons Way, Halesworth

Comment ID      1043

Comment         Proximity to Gothic House, grade II* listed building. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Building.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section | Potential land for development 86 - Land off Saxons Way, Halesworth

Comment ID | 1044

Comment | Proximity to Gothic House, grade II* listed building. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Building.
**Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 86 - Land off Saxons Way, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Based on aerial photographs, sites 14; 76; 86; and 160 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section: Potential land for development 86 - Land off Saxons Way, Halesworth

Comment ID: 798

Comment: This site was the route for the planned Phase 2 of the Halesworth Relief Road. It borders the London Road estate and the Millennium Green. A carefully designed scheme could work very well with access from Bigod Close/Lansbury Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tony Langford</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 87 - Land on Bungay Road, Holton

Anonymous

Section Potential land for development 87 - Land on Bungay Road, Holton

Comment ID 173

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 87 - Land on Bungay Road, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 87 and 89 are in Holton and this area has potential flooding problems and so needs thorough investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halesworth Town Council N Rees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 87 - Land on Bungay Road, Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Site 87 and 89 are in Holton and this area has potential flooding problems and so needs thorough investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England Debbie Mack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 87 - Land on Bungay Road, Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Gavelcroft, grade II listed to north east. Potential impact on setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

**Section**  
Potential land for development 87 - Land on Bungay Road, Holton

**Comment ID**  
799

**Comment**  
Site 87 & 89 Whilst within the village concept, the development of 75 houses between the two sites may be too much for the western side of Holton to contend with, given the flooding problems that Holton has suffered in the past.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher  
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section: Potential land for development 87 - Land on Bungay Road, Holton

Comment ID: 708

Comment:
1.0 The "Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" is encouraging in that the only negative points identified relate to (a)" Conserving and enhancing the quality and distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes" (b) Conserving natural resources (c) To reduce contribution to climate change and mitigate effects"  
Whilst there are 4 plus points:  
 mỡ Health and well-being  
 mỡ Improving access to key services & facilities  
 mỡ Meeting housing requirements of the whole community and  
 mỡ Encouraging efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth  

2.0 With regards to (a) the site is effectively an Infill site being sandwiched between Valley Farm to the north west and suburban development to the south east whilst opposite the site to the North East there is a large residential property. With regard to (a) (b) & (c),it is inevitable that there will be negative issues around the rural location being a greenfield site but this situation applies to the vast majority of sites being promoted through this land bid exercise. Furthermore, there is sufficient room to include strategic planting to enhance the development and to mitigate the already limited impact it may have on the rural hinterland.  

3.0 The LPA recognises that the site is in a sustainable location being relatively close to a range of facilities and could assist in providing both much needed affordable and starter homes. The site offer potentially 30 dwellings (LPA estimate) and although a greenfield site, with the present search for sites, the LPA has recognised that greenfield development is inevitable. This is particularly the case given the lack of progress with regard to delivery of significant amounts of residential development around the Lake Lothing area within Lowestoft.  

4.0 The Council predicts that at least 7700 new homes will be needed up to 2036. Indeed the LPA recognises that this figure could be as high as 9500; and therefore there is considerable pressure to release additional housing land. The LPA has also indicated that 630 dwellings have been built throughout the district between 2011 and 2015. This equates to 158 per
annum. Taking the lower figure above (7700) the requirement is 308 per annum (over the 25 year period between 2011 & 2036, whilst the highest figure represents the need for 380 per year.

5.0 Notwithstanding the fact that there are planning permissions in place for over 3000 dwellings and a further 633 included in allocated sites, nonetheless as illustrated by the Lake Lothing situation, there is some doubt over the ability to deliver the required housing. The fact that the Council is still seeking further sites at present reinforces this position and it follows that there will be likely to be a significant shortfall; and therefore there is even greater need to promote sites which are available, viable and deliverable in accordance with Para 47 of the NPPF.

6.0 It is understood that there are no viability issues with this particular site and therefore development could be delivered relatively swiftly, and in so doing help to achieve both the Councils required 5YHLS and its Housing Strategy, if supported by the LPA.
Potential land for development 88 - Land on Hulver Road, Mutford

Charlotte Sanderson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 88 - Land on Hulver Road, Mutford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Not a sustainable place to build 140 houses. It would change the rural characteristics of the area, the occupants would be completely reliant on a car as there are little or no services in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 88 - Land on Hulver Road, Mutford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Close to Kiers Cottage, Grade II Potential impact on setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mutford Parish Council John Armstrong

Section Potential land for development 88 - Land on Hulver Road, Mutford

Comment ID 1237

Comment At their last meeting the Council also agreed that the proposed sites were totally unsuitable for development. Site 131 is a greenfield site, site 88 is also a greenfield site and would extend the curtilage of the Village and also impact on two grade 2 listed buildings. Council is also undertaking a neighbourhood plan and wish to wait until the outcome of the consultation process is known before responding to the other questions.
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher  
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 88 - Land on Hulver Road, Mutford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment                          | 1.0 The "Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" highlights the following negative points:  
(a) Access to key services  
(b) Enhancing landscape  
(c) Conserving natural resources  
(d) To reduce contribution to climate change and mitigate effects  
Whilst there are 2 positive factors:  
- Improving health & well being  
- Meeting housing requirements of the whole community  
2.0 The site is identified by the LPA to have the potential for 140 dwellings. This site is adjacent existing development at the western end of Mutford (Newson Avenue) with footpath access into the village. The site will provide general market, affordable and starter homes  
3.0 With regard to (a) (c) & (d) above, it is inevitable that there will be negative issues around the rural location being a greenfield site but this situation applies to the vast majority of sites being promoted through this land bid exercise. Furthermore, with regard to (b) there is sufficient room to substantially reinforce existing hedge cover to include strategic planting to enhance the development and to mitigate impact it may have on the rural hinterland.  
4.0 The site offer potentially up to 140 dwellings (based on the LPA higher estimate) and could form part of a new rural settlement as advocated by the LPA under Option 4. Furthermore, although this is a greenfield site, given the present search for sites, the LPA has recognised that greenfield development throughout the district is inevitable. This is particularly the case given the lack of progress with regard to delivery of significant amounts of residential development around the Lake Lothing area within Lowestoft.  
5.0 The Council predicts that at least 7700 new homes will be needed up to 2036. Indeed the LPA recognises that this figure could be as high as 9500; and therefore there is considerable pressure to release additional housing land and has indicated that 630 dwellings have been built throughout the district between 2011 and 2015. This equates to 158 per annum. Taking the lower figure above the requirement is 308 per annum (over the 25 year
period between 2011 & 2036), whilst the highest figure represents the need for 380 per year.

6.0 Notwithstanding the fact that there are planning permissions in place for over 3000 dwellings and a further 633 included in allocated sites, nonetheless as illustrated by the Lake Lothing situation, there is some doubt over the ability to deliver the required housing. The fact that the Council is still seeking further sites at present reinforces this position and it follows that there will be likely to be a significant shortfall; and therefore the there is even greater need to promote sites which are available, viable and deliverable in accordance with Para 47 of the NPPF.

7.0 It is understood that there are no viability issues with this particular site and therefore development could be delivered relatively swiftly, and in so doing help to achieve the both the Councils required 5YHLS and its Housing Strategy if supported by the LPA.
Potential land for development 89 - Land on Lodge Road, Holton

Anonymous

Section Potential land for development 89 - Land on Lodge Road, Holton

Comment ID 174

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Halesworth Town Council N Rees</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lavery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 89 - Land on Lodge Road, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

Sites 8; 9; 44; 60; 62; 81; 82 and 89 form a large block of land which is likely to be of some value, particularly for farmland species. Careful consideration should therefore be given to the allocation of these sites for residential development, in order to ensure that it does not result in an adverse impact on the wildlife value of the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 89 - Land on Lodge Road, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 87 &amp; 89 Whilst within the village concept, the development of 75 houses between the two sites may be too much for the western side of Holton to contend with, given the flooding problems that Holton has suffered in the past.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher**  
**MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 89 - Land on Lodge Road, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

1.0 The "Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" is encouraging in that the only negative points identified relate to:
   - (a) "Conserving and enhancing the quality and distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes"
   - (b) Conserving natural resources
   - (c) To reduce contribution to climate change and mitigate effects"

Whilst there are 4 plus points:

- Health and well-being
- Improving access to key services & facilities
- Meeting housing requirements of the whole community and
- Encouraging efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

2.0 The site is identified by the LPA to have the potential for 45 dwellings but this includes the 11 dwellings previously approved, and under construction on the southern and eastern sides of this field. Development of this site would effectively consolidate and form a complimentary scheme to that which is underway. Access would be gained via the existing Y junction approved under the granting of the last planning permission, which incidentally is delivering 8 affordable dwellings alongside 3 general market dwellings. The precedent set by the previous permission would underline the fact that development on this site should not significantly impact on the rural setting despite being on a field with a slight incline running downwards from north to south.

3.0 With regard to (a) (b) & (c) above, it is inevitable that there will be negative issues around the rural location being a greenfield site but this situation applies to the vast majority of sites being promoted through this land bid exercise. Furthermore, there is sufficient room to include strategic planting to enhance the development and to mitigate the limited impact it may have on the rural hinterland which in any event could be reinforced by existing hedging along the northern and western boundaries, as recognised by the LPA.

4.0 The LPA recognises that the site is in a sustainable location being relatively close to a range of facilities and could assist in providing both much needed affordable and starter homes. The site offer potentially
around 35 dwellings (taking into account the LPA estimate) and although a
greenfield site, given the present search for sites, the LPA has recognised
that greenfield development throughout the district is inevitable. This is
particularly the case given the lack of progress with regard to delivery of
significant amounts of residential development around the Lake Lothing
area within Lowestoft.

5.0 The Council predicts that at least 7700 new homes will be needed up to
2036. Indeed the LPA recognises that this figure could be as high as 9500;
and therefore there is considerable pressure to release additional housing
land. The LPA has also indicated that 630 dwellings have been built
throughout the district between 2011 and 2015. This equates to 158 per
annum. Taking the lower figure above (7700) the requirement is 308 per
annum (over the 25 year period between 2011 & 2036), whilst the highest
figure represents the need for 380 per year.

6.0 Notwithstanding the fact that there are planning permissions in place
for over 3000 dwellings and a further 633 included in allocated sites,
nonetheless as illustrated by the Lake Lothing situation, there is some
doubt over the ability to deliver the required housing. The fact that the
Council is still seeking further sites at present reinforces this position and it
follows that there will be likely to be a significant shortfall ;and therefore
there is even greater need to promote sites which are available, viable and
deliverable in accordance with Para 47 of the NPPF .

7.0 It is understood that there are no viability issues with this particular site
and therefore development could be delivered relatively swiftly, and in so
doing help to achieve both the Councils required 5YHLS and its Housing
Strategy, if supported by the LPA.
## Potential land for development 90 - Land on The Hill, Barnby, Barnby / Mutford

**Barnby Parish Council Ian Hinton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 90 - Land on The Hill, Barnby, Barnby / Mutford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>On the Hill, next to the Hundred Drain – part of this site already subject of a proposal for affordable housing which is under extended consideration. The Parish Council supported this application as it was for affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 90 - Land on The Hill, Barnby, Barnby / Mutford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site is appropriate to the size of the village for future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 90 - Land on The Hill, Barnby, Barnby / Mutford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Group of sites around Barnby/North Cove – In addition to potential impacts on landscape character (LCA5) and visual amenity for users of the Broads, further development of housing has the potential to increase the recreational pressures on the Broads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David Ragan

Section  Potential land for development 90 - Land on The Hill, Barnby, Barnby / Mutford

Comment ID  512

Comment  Having lived in barnby for 20 years, we feel that this site for proposal is unsuitable due to the following reasons:
There is no mains drainage, and already the water running down the hill adds to this problem
It is on a high water table area.
It is also bordering on a SSI SITE.
It is also situated on the dangerous bit of a road leading to the A146 which is already a dangerous junction also it only allows 1 car down at a time, with much more traffic this could be highly dangerous.
also getting out onto the A146 from the only other junction is at times very frustrating and dangerous.
thankyou
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 90 - Land on The Hill, Barnby, Barnby / Mutford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to Garden House, grade II listed to west. Potential impact on setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julie Reid

Section  Potential land for development 90 - Land on The Hill, Barnby, Barnby / Mutford

Comment ID  489

Comment  This site seems proportionally appropriate in size to the village for future development, provided an environmental impact survey was to be carried out. Infrastructure currently exists.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
<td>Potential land for development 90 - Land on The Hill, Barnby, Barnby / Mutford</td>
<td>I think land in the Barnby area should be discounted because of the poor logistical position of the sites and the strain on the existing roads especially the A146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 90 - Land on The Hill, Barnby, Barnby / Mutford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Development into the open countryside. Natural SUD of villages will cause flooding in North Cove if built on. Part of green infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section Potential land for development 90 - Land on The Hill, Barnby, Barnby / Mutford

Comment ID 711

Comment 1.0 The "Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" is encouraging in that the only negative points identified relate to:
"(a) Conserving natural resources
(b) To reduce contribution to climate change and mitigate effects
(c) Enhancing biodiversity & geodiversity"
Whilst there are 5 plus points:
- Health and well-being
- Improving access to key services & facilities
- Reducing deprivation in all forms
- Meeting housing requirements of the whole community
- Enhance the rural economy

2.0 The site is identified by the LPA to have the potential for 45 dwellings including the northern part of the site where there is an outstanding planning application for 11 dwellings (8 affordable subsidised by 3 general market dwellings - LPA ref DC/15/1439)) which has the benefit of a resolution to approve by the LPA (subject to a S106 Legal Agreement to ring fence the affordable Housing element from being sold on as general market housing). Development of this site would effectively consolidate and form a complimentary scheme to the proposal referred to above. It is interesting to note that this site, quite rightly, is considered to be capable of addressing deprivation through the introduction of affordable housing whilst this criterion has not been acknowledged on some other proposed sites where affordable housing will also be included.

3.0 This site could be built as a stand-alone development at a relatively low density (20-25 per hectare is suggested) utilising the access to the site ref DC/15/1439, or as suggested by the LPA in tandem with Site 57 to the east. Highway access would be gained via the 15/1439 scheme The precedent set by the previous resolution to approve serves to underline the fact that development on this site should not significantly impact on the rural setting.

4.0 With regard to (a) (b) & (c) above, It is inevitable that there will be negative issues around the rural location being a greenfield site but this situation applies to the vast majority of sites being promoted through this
land bid exercise. Furthermore, there is sufficient room to reinforce existing hedge cover to include strategic planting to enhance the development and to mitigate the limited impact it may have on the rural hinterland, particularly on the southern boundary adjacent to the A146, as suggested by the LPA. The LPA also recognises that this site is contained by existing development, particularly to the north east and west. Although the site is considered to provide Grade 2 agricultural land it is fallow and only used as a paddock for grazing horses occasionally and is not in active agricultural production.

5.0 The LPA recognises that the site is in a sustainable location being relatively close to facilities and could assist in providing both much needed affordable and starter homes. The site offer potentially between 25-45 dwellings (taking into account the LPA higher estimate) and although a greenfield site, given the present search for sites, the LPA has recognised that greenfield development throughout the district is inevitable. This is particularly the case given the lack of progress with regard to delivery of significant amounts of residential development around the Lake Lothing area within Lowestoft.

6.0 The Council predicts that at least 7700 new homes will be needed up to 2036. Indeed the LPA recognises that this figure could be as high as 9500; and therefore there is considerable pressure to release additional housing land. The LPA has also indicated that 630 dwellings have been built throughout the district between 2011 and 2015. This equates to 158 per annum. Taking the lower figure above (7700) the requirement is 308 per annum (over the 25 year period between 2011 & 2036), whilst the highest figure represents the need for 380 per year.

7.0 Notwithstanding the fact that there are planning permissions in place for over 3000 dwellings and a further 633 included in allocated sites, nonetheless as illustrated by the Lake Lothing situation, there is some doubt over the ability to deliver the required housing. The fact that the Council is still seeking further sites at present reinforces this position and it follows that there will be likely to be a significant shortfall; and therefore there is even greater need to promote sites which are available, viable and deliverable in accordance with Para 47 of the NPPF.

8.0 It is understood that there are no viability issues with this particular site and therefore development could be delivered relatively swiftly, and in so doing help to achieve both the Councils required SYHLS and its Housing Strategy, if supported by the LPA.
### Potential land for development 91 - Land on the junction of St Olaves Road & Slugg Lane, Herringfleet

**Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council S H Read**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 91 - Land on the junction of St Olaves Road &amp; Slugg Lane, Herringfleet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This site is within the Broads Authority executive area and should not be included in this consultation. However, as the Broads Authority is also reviewing its Local Plan the Parish Council will comment on this proposal. It is accepted that this site is not immediately adjacent to any of the main development of the villages but there was some support for housing here, although not at the density shown in the consultation document. This site might be suitable for future consideration for housing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 91 - Land on the junction of St Olaves Road &amp; Slugg Lane, Herringfleet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 91 is within the Broads Authority Executive Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 91 - Land on the junction of St Olaves Road &amp; Slugg Lane, Herringfleet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to Manor House Farmhouse, Barn and garden walls, all grade II listed. Potential impact upon setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julie Reynolds

Section  
Potential land for development 91 - Land on the junction of St Olaves Road & Slugg Lane, Herringfleet

Comment ID  
193

Comment  
Too isolated and disjointed from the village.
Paul Douch

**Section**  
Potential land for development 91 - Land on the junction of St Olaves Road & Slugg Lane, Herringfleet

**Comment ID**  
444

**Comment**  
 Totally inappropriate & undesirable; vehicular access dangerous onto both B1074 and Slugs Lane
Wellington Construction Ltd Paul Pitcher
MDPC Ltd (Malcolm Dixon)

Section  Potential land for development 91 - Land on the junction of St Olaves Road & Slugg Lane, Herringfleet

Comment ID  712

Comment  1.0 The "Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" highlights the following negative points:
(a) efficient patterns of movement
(b) To reduce contribution to climate change and mitigate effects
(c) Conserving natural resources
Whilst there is 1 positive factor:
Meeting housing requirements of the whole community
2.0 The site is identified by the LPA to have the potential for 16 dwellings. This site is currently used as paddocks and is adjacent to existing sporadic housing and farms/farm buildings dotted along St Olaves Rd Herringfleet. It is reasonably close to Somerleyton where local facilities and a railway station are available.
3.0 With regard to (a) (b) & (c) above, it is inevitable that there will be negative issues around the rural location being a greenfield site but this situation applies to the vast majority of sites being promoted through this land bid exercise. Furthermore, there is sufficient room to substantially reinforce existing hedge cover to include strategic planting to enhance the development and to mitigate impact it may have on the rural hinterland.
4.0 The site offer potentially up to 16 dwellings (based on the LPA estimate) including affordable housing and starter home provision. Furthermore, although this is a greenfield site, given the present search for sites, the LPA has recognised that greenfield development throughout the district is inevitable. This is particularly the case given the lack of progress with regard to delivery of significant amounts of residential development around the Lake Lothing area within Lowestoft.
5.0 The Council predicts that at least 7700 new homes will be needed up to 2036. Indeed the LPA recognises that this figure could be as high as 9500; and therefore there is considerable pressure to release additional housing land . The LPA has also indicated that 630 dwellings have been built throughout the district between 2011 and 2015. This equates to 158 per annum. Taking the lower figure above (7700) the requirement is 308 per annum (over the 25 year period between 2011 & 2036), whilst the highest figure represents the need for 380 per year.
6.0 Notwithstanding the fact that there are planning permissions in place for over 3000 dwellings and a further 633 included in allocated sites, nonetheless as illustrated by the Lake Lothing situation, there is some doubt over the ability to deliver the required housing. The fact that the Council is still seeking further sites at present reinforces this position and it follows that there will be likely to be a significant shortfall; and therefore there is even greater need to promote sites which are available, viable and deliverable in accordance with Para 47 of the NPPF.

7.0 It is understood that there are no viability issues with this particular site and therefore development could be delivered relatively swiftly, and in so doing help to achieve both the Councils required 5YHLS and its Housing Strategy, if supported by the LPA.
Potential land for development 92 - Land on the south side of Southwold Road, Brampton with Stoven

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 92 - Land on the south side of Southwold Road, Brampton with Stoven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to The Old Rectory, grade II to south west. Brampton Hall Grade II and Church of St Peter grade I further south. Potential impact upon setting of high grade and other listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 93 - Land on the south side of Southwold Road (2), Brampton with Stoven

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 93 - Land on the south side of Southwold Road (2), Brampton with Stoven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to The Old Rectory, grade II to south west. Brampton Hall Grade II and Church of St Peter grade I further south. Potential impact upon setting of high grade and other listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 94 - Land on the West Side of London Road, Shadingfield

Historic England Debbie Mack

Section Potential land for development 94 - Land on the West Side of London Road, Shadingfield

Comment ID 1052

Comment Proximity to Park Farmhouse grade II to west and Shadingfield House grade II to south. Potential impact upon setting of listed buildings.
Sotterley Estate Tom Barne
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section
Potential land for development 94 - Land on the West Side of London Road, Shadingfield

Comment ID
1191

Comment
Site Description
9.1 Site Option 94 is located south of the village and in an exposed position on the edge of open countryside to the south.
9.2 Development in this location would lead to coalescence with Shadingfield to the south being just over 30m from the edge of the village.
9.3 Site Option 94 scores less well than the other sites in Willingham and is further away from the village facilities.
9.4 No other sites have been put forward by this land owner so there are not the opportunities for additional and improved community facilities that the Sotterley Estate are able to offer i.e. the opportunity for a circular walk from Sotterley Road to the footpath adjacent to Fox Farmhouse.
Potential land for development 96 - Land opposite St Michael's Church, Church Lane, Oulton

Adam Skinner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 96 - Land opposite St Michael's Church, Church Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>this land is suitable for housing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 96 - Land opposite St Michael's Church, Church Lane, Oulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Opposite Church of St Michael, grade I listed building. Potential impact upon setting of high grade listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential land for development 96 - Land opposite St Michael's Church, Church Lane, Oulton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sites not suitable for development:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Land opposite St Michael’s Church, Church Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section
Potential land for development 96 - Land opposite St Michael's Church, Church Lane, Oulton

Comment ID
730

Comment
Sites 18; 23; 51; 53 and 96 are in close proximity of areas of sensitive wetland habitat including Oulton Marshes CWS and Dairy Farm Marshes CWS. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact nearby sensitive areas.
Potential land for development 97 - Land opposite Stoven Row Southwold Road, Brampton with Stoven

Historic England Debbie Mack

Section
Potential land for development 97 - Land opposite Stoven Row Southwold Road, Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID
1054

Comment
Proximity to Church of St Margaret grade II* and on Heritage at Risk Register - and Church Farmhouse grade II in close proximity to the east. Also Cherry Tree Public House grade II to east. Potential impact to setting of high grade and other listed buildings.
**Potential land for development 98 - Land rear of Elizabeth Terrace, A12 London Road, Gisleham**

**Bruce Provan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 98 - Land rear of Elizabeth Terrace, A12 London Road, Gisleham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>It is crucial to keep the buffer between Lowestoft and Kessingland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 98 - Land rear of Elizabeth Terrace, A12 London Road, Gisleham

Comment ID 724

Comment Based on aerial photographs, sites 21; 22; 34 and 98 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.
Teresa Garbutt

Section Potential land for development 98 - Land rear of Elizabeth Terrace, A12 London Road, Gisleham

Comment ID 199

Comment As a long-term resident of the Waveney area, please find below my thoughts/comments on three of the proposed blocks of land:
Site 22 (117 proposed dwellings) – Hammonds Farm
Site 147 (473 proposed dwellings) – Old Rifle Range
Site 98 (54 proposed dwellings) – Rear of Elizabeth Terrace

These three sites provide a fabulous opportunity for different types of housing in South Lowestoft. Each block of land could provide a specific type of housing to meet different needs, and together they would form a diverse development that accommodates residents of all ages. The three sites could be developed as follows:
Site 22 – Affordable rented 1-2 bed apartments
Site 147 – Affordable rented 2-3 bed houses
Site 98 – Affordable rented 1-2 bed retirement accommodation (flats/bungalows)

Sites 22, 147 and 98 are also ideally placed to service this diverse range of residents, and the surrounding amenities would fulfil their requirements and provide a greater quality of life:
1. Close to schools for those with children
2. Close to shops (literally over the road, so can leave car at home and reduce carbon footprint)
3. On main bus route – Lowestoft to the north, and Kessingland/Southwold to the south
4. Close to the beach. This provides a free 'day out' for those with young children, and a pleasant walk in the fresh air for older residents. Many elderly people have mobility issues, and the proximity of the beach to the three sites makes it feasible in terms of exercise and enjoying the natural environment

This site could also provide an opportunity to provide a new type of private 'rented' property to the residents of Waveney. A large percentage of the population are now priced out of the housing market, and according to The Guardian, 'by 2025, more than half those under 40 will be living in properties owned by private landlords' (2015, see link below).
http://www.theguardian.com/money/2015/jul/22/pwc-report-generation-rent-to-grow-over-next-decade
Unfortunately, many of these people are not only priced out of the housing market, but are also ineligible for Social Housing. This leaves them in a 'no man's land' of private rentals, with little long-term security based on the current practice of 'two months notice' within their tenancy agreements. Could Waveney provide quality and affordable 'private' rental properties that give greater security to tenants? After an initial six months probation within the property, could a longer lease period be agreed between tenant and landlord (say 5-10 years) as they do in continental Europe? This would be beneficial on several levels:

- Landlords have the security of knowing they have a quality tenant in their property
- Tenants have the security of knowing they are not permanently on 'two months notice' within the property.

(This also encourages investment in the property by the tenant (new carpets, decoration etc), that they may not feel committed to make on a short term notice lease)
- Tenants looking to rent for a fixed term (5-10 years) could use that period in an 'affordable' rented property to save up for a deposit on a place of their own. If they subsequently become part of a couple, then a double income can assist in this process

All of the above contributes to a greater harmony in the landlord/tenant relationship, and provides stable and realistic housing opportunities for the residents of Waveney.

I believe that these three sites have fabulous housing potential within the Lowestoft area, and provide a very good quality of life for the future residents who live there.
Trevor Cooke
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section
Potential land for development 98 - Land rear of Elizabeth Terrace, A12 London Road, Gisleham

Comment ID
683

Comment
The "Initial sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" paper is encouraging in that the only negative points identified relate to;
(A) "conserving and enhancing the quality and distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes"
(B) "reducing contributions to climate change and mitigate effects"
(C) "Conserving natural resources"
In response to item (A), whilst this is certainly a matter for consideration, we believe this potential issue can be addressed by the implementation of strategic landscaping in association with any future development, as well as the inclusion of attractive open space. With regard to items (B) and (C), considering Site 98 is Greenfield land, it is often the case that potential issues can be identified in relation to these matters, however given the scale and situation of the site, we believe that a potential development could be designed to involve particular features and possibly infrastructure improvements to mitigate and counteract these potential issues.
The site extends to approximately 1.58 hectares and could accommodate up to approximately 45 dwellings (based on an assumed 30 dwellings per hectare). The site is within the sole ownership of our client and is considered suitable, available and deliverable in the next 1-5 years.
The site is potentially accessible from the A12 London Road, and benefits from a road frontage of approximately 50 meters, and given it's situation and proximity to existing dwellings it would be easily serviceable. It is within cycling distance of Lowestoft, a key area for prospective employment growth over the coming plan period.
It should be noted that historically, seven residential properties were situated on the site, and that the associated footings are still in situ.
The development of Site 98 could also involve Sites 22 and 147 to the north, as these sites are also owned by Mr T Cooke. This could, potentially, allow for a larger and carefully considered strategic development which may perhaps involve a more substantial road network leading from the A12 London Road.
Subsequent to the previous narrative, we consider the site to represent a sustainable opportunity for development and we look forward to continued
engagement with the emerging Local Plan process in relation to this site.
Potential land for development 99 - Land south east of Brickfields, Somerleyton

Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council S H Read

Section  
Potential land for development 99 - Land south east of Brickfields, Somerleyton

Comment ID  
697

Comment  
This site is not suitable for housing development as it will ruin the open aspect of the countryside, it has little connection with the centre of the village and the access would be onto an already dangerous corner where The Street meets Slugs Lane.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gerda Gibbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 99 - Land south east of Brickfields, Somerleyton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment | This land is of historic interest as it is the site of the old brickfields that manufactured the well known Somerleyton red bricks. The actual sites to the old kilns are accessed by a pretty lane edged by bushes and trees passing by the lane to the Marina. The area where the ruins of the old brick kilns stand is an area filled with wild flowers and an abundance of wildlife including nesting Whitethroats and Blackcaps. This area is maintained by a group of volunteers. From the Brick kiln site the view over the proposed site (99) is lovely and filled with birdsong and the occasional woodpecker call. It would be shame to spoil such a lovely area with further development. |
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  
Potential land for development 99 - Land south east of Brickfields, Somerleyton

Comment ID  
1055

Comment  
Adjacent to Conservation Area and proximity to White House and Pond Cottages, both grade II listed to north east. Potential impact on setting of listed buildings and conservation area.
Joy Jones

Section  Potential land for development 99 - Land south east of Brickfields, Somerleyton

Comment ID  562

Comment  As a home owner of one of the Brickfields cottages I would not like to see any housing development on this site for the following reasons
1) New housing here would increase volume of traffic through the village. Access to this site is on a blind bend when turning into Brickfields or the boat yard from Sluggs Lane and is already difficult. Increasing traffic here would increase risk of accidents.
2) Brickfields is part of the historic character of Somerleyton, which draws walkers and tourists to the village and provides income for business (pub, shop etc). Brickfields homeowners are required to maintain the historic appearance of their houses and new housing in this area would not be in keeping with the character of the village especially its Victorian history.
3) The site is a very pretty green area. We see a huge variety of wildlife on a daily basis on this site including barn and other owls, deer, many different birds and bats. To build on this site would destroy an important green space in the village. The footpath beside the site is part of Angles Way and this section of the path would lose its beauty if it became a housing estate. More housing here would also mean more artificial light at night in a place where we have dark skies and no light pollution.
4) If there is a need for more housing in Somerleyton I would prefer it to be on a site that has better access for vehicles and a site that has already been built on such as site 47, land at the former garage. Site 47 is nearer to the junction / turning to Lowestoft and is not used at the moment. The Brickfields site is used for crops and to build on this we would lose part of our countryside.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julie Reynolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Douch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Description and Development Potential

12.1 Site Option 99 is located off The Street and to the south of The Cedars. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 10. The site is 0.48ha in size and is generally flat, sloping slightly to the south.

12.2 According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 14 dwellings on this part of the site. Following the form and density of nearby development at Brickfields Cottages and Marsh lane the site has capacity in excess of the 5 dwelling minimum threshold and it is likely that, dependant on housing type, a figure of 8 to 12 dwellings (including 2 to 4 affordable homes) would be appropriate for this site.

12.3 Access to the site would be via a short stretch of private roadway owned by the Estate which also serves The Cedars, the boatyard and marina which would be improved.

12.4 Visibility at the junction with The Street is good in both directions extending some 50m to the left and 60m to the right on exiting into a 30mph zone.

12.5 The site is currently in agricultural use in an area of Grade 3 land.

Assessment Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal

12.6 The site sustainability appraisal (SSA) at Point s 1 and 4 refer to "limited village facilities". This is incorrect. The Waveney village profile or Somerleyton confirms that there is a full suite of key facilities and this needs to be recognised.

12.7 At Point 9 the SSA states "not consistent with existing settlement form". We disagree with this assessment. One need only look at the form of development along Brickfields Cottages and Marsh Lane nearby to see how a site of this shape could provide for a linear development of similar form. Suggest the score is raised to 0 (neutral).
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section
Potential land for development 100 - Land south of 1-4 North End, St James Road, All Saints and St Nicholas South Elmham

Comment ID 1056

Comment
Whaleys grade II* listed building to west, The Elms, also grade II* west and a number of grade II listed buildings including The Willows and Barn to the north, and All Saints cottage to the south and Moat Farmhouse to the east. Potential impact upon setting of high grade and other listed buildings.
Potential land for development 101 - Land south of Hill Cottages, Shadingfield

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 101 - Land south of Hill Cottages, Shadingfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Turnpike Farm grade II to west, Hill Farmhouse grade II* and Service Range grade II to north. Potential impact of setting of listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Waveney District Council is responsible for planning for the housing and employment land needed in Waveney in the future. They are in the first stages of preparing a new local plan which will determine the number and location of new housing and employment sites in the District for the period up to 2036.

1.2 As part of this process the District Council is consulting on the sites submitted to them as a result of the Call for Sites consultation earlier this year and the future development options for the District.

1.3 Evolution Town Planning have been instructed by the Sotterley Estate to make representations to this public consultation. This is an early stage in the process whereby the Council allocates sites for housing and employment development.

1.4 Evolution Town Planning (ETP) are experienced in promoting rural sites either through development plan representations or planning applications. We also have site assessment experience from working in Council planning departments. As a practice we have 30 years of combined professional experience in this type of work.

1.5 These representations involve a potential housing site in Shadingfield and respond to the District Council’s Site Options. We have also responded to questions in the consultation document and completed the requisite proforma which has been submitted separately. It is included here in Appendix 1 for ease of reference.

1.6 These representations build on the information submitted to the Call for Sites consultation and should be read alongside them.

1.7 The site has been assessed and we consider it remains suitable, available, achievable and viable taking into account relevant policy requirements and obligations.

1.8 The identification of the site results from a village-wide walk over and assessment of the development potential. The plan in Appendix 2 identifies the site, its location in the village and its surroundings.

1.9 According to evidence in the Waveney Village Profiles and from our tour of the village Shadingfield benefits from a number of local facilities and
services shared with Willingham which contribute to its sustainability.

1.10 The Sotterley Estate is open to the tenure and mix of housing which could be delivered in the village. Much depends on the final site selection and local needs but could include bungalows, affordable housing and smaller homes for first time buyers.

1.11 Because it is unclear at this stage precisely how the District Council will be responding to recent Government guidance on boosting housing supply and recognising the benefits of rural housing the recognition of the village’s sustainability credentials this is something we will be pursuing through the local plan review.

1.12 In the meantime we invite the District Council to consider the information in this report, the merits of the site to enable the village of Shadingfield it to ‘play its role in delivering sustainable development’ in Waveney.

2.0 Planning Policy

2.1 The Waveney Core Strategy dated 2009 was an early respondent to the 2004 Planning Act in respect of the adoption of the Local Development Framework in comparison to other Council’s in Suffolk.

2.2 While direct comparisons are difficult it is apparent that other District Council’s direct development to smaller settlements than do Waveney. For example Suffolk Coastal (2013) identify local service centres and ‘other’ villages, St Edmundsbury (2014) identify local service centres and infill villages and Babergh (2014) identify hinterland villages.

2.3 In comparison to these other Core Strategies in Suffolk, partly due to its age, the Waveney LDF gives relatively little attention to the contribution that villages can play in contributing to rural housing supply. A large number of villages, often with access to local services, are relegated to being classified as being in the open countryside where a general safeguarding approach is advocated in the Waveney Core Strategy.

2.4 The Waveney Core Strategy predates the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and more recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and as such is becoming increasingly out of step with national planning policy imperatives. Plus recent Government requirements for local plans to be in place by early 2017.

2.5 For example the Framework states that "To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby".

2.6 The PPG provides further guidance on rural housing and states (our emphasis in bold):
"Rural Housing How should local authorities support sustainable rural communities? Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306

It is important to recognise the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability, and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements. This is clearly set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in the core planning principles, the section on supporting a prosperous rural economy and the section on housing.

A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities.

Assessing housing need and allocating sites should be considered at a strategic level and through the Local Plan and/or neighbourhood plan process. However, all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.

The National Planning Policy Framework also recognises that different sustainable transport policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas."

2.7 The Waveney New Local Plan is at an early stage and it is not yet clear how Waveney District Council will be responding to these national policy imperatives and how this will be reflected in revisions to the settlement hierarchy in the spatial strategy.

2.8 It is not known whether the District Council will refresh their settlement hierarchy and direct a proportionate amount of housing to all sustainable settlements including villages previously overlooked or whether they will abandon the 'blanket approach' of settlement boundaries and allow development where it can be shown to be sustainable and well related to the built form. Much will depend on the responses the Council receives to the Issues and Options consultation.

2.9 In terms of policy guidance on the site assessments below we have had regard to policies of the adopted Core Strategy (2009), the CIL Charging Schedule and the Development Management document (2011); specifically policies DM16 Housing Density, DM17 Housing Type and Mix and DM18 Affordable Housing.

2.10 The Council acknowledges the need to review these policies as part of the new Local Plan as they were based on former national planning policy
priorities and predate the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

2.11 These local policy documents are adopted and, as the Council acknowledges, form a useful baseline now and we have had regard to them in the same manner.

2.12 The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) seeks to deliver sustainable development. We consider that the assessment below shows that the residential development of any of the sites we have submitted will meet the social, environmental and economic tests for sustainable development.

3.0 The Village of Shadingfield

Geography

3.1 Shadingfield is located in the centre of Waveney District and is 5 miles from the town of Beccles and 6.8 miles from Halesworth. Shadingfield is on the Anglian Bus route between Beccles and Southwold. The A145 between Blythburgh to Beccles road runs through the village.

3.2 The population of Shadingfield is 178 people. The village is part of the combined parish of Shadingfield, Sotterley, Willingham and Ellough (with Weston) which has a combined population of at least 700 people. This is important because, as set out above, the NPPF recognises that "development in one village may support services in a village nearby " and Willingham is centrally located to these other villages.

3.3 With the exception of a few nearby listed buildings Shadingfield village is without environmental or heritage designations that would inhibit development.

Key Facilities

3.4 The Waveney District Council Village Profile (Appendix 3) for Shadingfield lists the key facilities which contribute to the sustainability of a settlement.

3.5 If read in conjunction with the village profile for Willingham (because of its close functional relationship) the key facilities include a public house, and meeting place. Additionally Willingham has the playing field, bus shelter and stops, post box and recycling point.

4.0 Site Option 101 Land South of Hill Cottages

Site Description and Development Potential

4.1 The site is located in Shadingfield, south of Hill Cottages and off the A145 London Road. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 2.

4.2 The site is 0.4ha in size and is well related to neighbouring built form in what is an elongated village of groups of dwellings. It is a regular shape with a pair of goal posts and some play equipment in one corner.

4.3 According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 12 dwellings on this part of the site.
4.4 More appropriately and reflecting the density of surrounding development this site could provide for at least 5 dwellings (including 1 affordable home) arranged in a manner sympathetic to the site and its location. This would probably in linear form fronting the road with a single shared access.

4.5 The site is bounded to the north and south by residential land use and to the east and west by agricultural use.

4.6 The site has a significant frontage onto London Rd which is in a 30mph zone.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 This report promotes a site in Shadingfield in response to the new Local Plan Issues and Options consultation. The extent of land allocations in Shadingfield will depend on the increase in housing demand across the District since the local development framework was adopted in 2009.

5.2 There is a pressing need to deliver a significant boost in housing supply nationally and Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that rural areas can play their part. Shadingfield is a part of a group of villages that benefit from a range of facilities where development in one can support services and facilities in another.

5.3 We have reviewed national and local planning policy and guidance and have visited the sites and toured the area. We submitted only those sites which met the consultation threshold and the criteria set out in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment consultation methodology (Oct 2015).

5.4 Our site assessment shows that the site remains suitable, available and achievable and that an allocation for development could meet the economic, social and environmental principle of sustainable development.

5.5 The site has the ability to provide for a mix of housing types to meet the needs set out in the Waveney Housing Market Assessment and evidenced local need.

Map of site and Shadingfield village profile attached.
Potential land for development 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton

Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK Hannah Lorna Bevins

Section
Potential land for development 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton

Comment ID 1140

Comment
The following sites have been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/HP apparatus:
* 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane
* 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road
* 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road
* 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane

National Grid Gas Distribution would like to take this opportunity to advise prospective land developers and the local authority of the following:
Crossing of assets: Construction traffic should only cross the pipeline at locations agreed with National Grid. To facilitate these crossings protection or diversion may be required; depending on site condition and pipe parameters.
Cable Crossings: For all assets, the contractor / developer will need to consider the clearance and necessary protection measures. The crossing must be perpendicular to the asset. The crossing may require a deed of consent to be agreed prior to work commencing.
Piling: No piling should take place within 15m of gas distribution assets without prior agreement from a National Grid Representative.
Pipeline Safety: National Grid will need to ensure that access to the pipelines is maintained during and after construction.
Our HP/IP pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation to be monitored by a National Grid representative. Ground cover above gas distribution mains should not be reduced or increased. Our MP/LP mains will not be as deep as the pipelines.
A National Grid representative may be required to monitor any excavations or any embankment or dredging works within 3 metres of a HP/IP pipeline.
or within 10 metres of an Above Ground Installations (AGI). Monitoring of works in relation to MP/LP assets may be required by a National Grid representative. National Grid steel pipelines are cathodically protected to prevent corrosion to the pipeline. For further information please refer to SSW/22 (see further advice section below).

If you require any further information in relation to the above please contact National Grid's Plant Protection team via the email address at the top of this letter.

Appendices - National Grid Assets
Please find attached in:
* Appendix 1 provides maps of the sites referenced above in relation to the affected National Grid Gas Distribution (Intermediate Pressure /High Pressure) assets outlined above.
(map enclosed)
### Environment Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:  
*Source Protection Zone 1  
*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>G H Thomas</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halesworth Town Council N Rees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Archers Cottage, grade II to east. Potential impact on setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julian Munson

Section Potential land for development 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton

Comment ID 546

Comment Additional employment land allocation for Halesworth is welcomed to generate higher levels of locally based employment and therefore reducing need for people to travel to other locations for work. This site is close to the main road and existing employment sites so would appear appropriate (subject to design and planning and minimal impact on any local housing)
John Lavery

Section  Potential land for development 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton

Comment ID  139

Comment  It doesn't make any sense to take agricultural land here, especially as there is a huge brownfield site (the Airfield) just over the road - ripe for Industrial Development!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Halesworth &amp; Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential land for development 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halesworth needs industrial land allocation. Although this site has access via Sparrowhawk Road, ways must be found to mitigate problems of water run-off and traffic movements towards Holton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tony Langford

Section  
Potential land for development 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton

Comment ID  
32

Comment  
We need more employment sites in Halesworth and this is a sound location but would propose leaving some spaces near the housing on this road and leave the right-of-way that crosses the edge if this proposal intact.
Potential land for development 103 - Land south of The Street (adjacent to 36 Holton Road), Holton

Anonymous

Section | Potential land for development 103 - Land south of The Street (adjacent to 36 Holton Road), Holton

Comment ID | 176

**Environment Agency**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 103 - Land south of The Street (adjacent to 36 Holton Road), Holton

**Comment ID**  
1163

**Comment**  
We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:

- Source Protection Zone 2

*Source Protection Zone* - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).

Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section  
Potential land for development 103 - Land south of The Street (adjacent to 36 Holton Road), Holton

Comment ID  830

Comment  
Similarly, Sites 73 and 121,103, 148 are classified as Holton and HTC and Holton would need to look at this together.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 103 - Land south of The Street (adjacent to 36 Holton Road), Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Sites 32, 103 and 148 are Holton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 103 - Land south of The Street (adjacent to 36 Holton Road), Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent to Holton Conservation Area. Proximity to The Homestead, Grade II and Millside and Myrtle Cottage, both grade II. Potential impact on setting of listed buildings and Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Halesworth &amp; Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 103 - Land south of The Street (adjacent to 36 Holton Road), Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Housing on this site should only be considered if it is part of road safety improvements/development to improve the corner on the B1123 and junction of B1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 103 - Land south of The Street (adjacent to 36 Holton Road), Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Too dangerous a position for any housing or other developments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential land for development 104 - Land south of The Street, Wissett

**Environment Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 104 - Land south of The Street, Wissett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly in Flood Zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Flood Zone – A floodplain is the area that would naturally be affected by flooding if a river rises above its banks, or high tides and stormy seas cause flooding in coastal areas.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halesworth Town Council N Rees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 104 - Land south of The Street, Wissett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Site 104 is in Wissett.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section
Potential land for development 104 - Land south of The Street, Wissett

Comment ID
1060

Comment
Located in Wissett Conservation Area. Immediately adjacent to Whitehouse Farmhouse and Barn, both Grade II listed and Church of St Andrew, grade I listed to west. Significant impact upon Conservation Area and potential impact on setting of high grade listed building and other listed buildings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Janet Holden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lavery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michael Fontenoy

Section             Potential land for development 104 - Land south of The Street, Wissett

Comment ID         85

Comment             The road from Halesworth into the Saints through Wisset is narrow and would need serious upgrading to handle the additional vehicular traffic that this site and the other sites proposed in the villages in the Saints would generate. The road through Wisset is narrow with houses close to it so upgrading would be difficult. The options for public transport are currently limited so the council would have to persuade bus companies to provide services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 104 - Land south of The Street, Wissett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>House building on this site and scale would greatly increase the problems outlined in our submission for sites 106/140/141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Wissett Parish Council Bill Sampson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 104 - Land south of The Street, Wissett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Subsequent to the presentation attended by our Chair on 5th May and your email of 6th May, Wissett Parish Council discussed this matter at length on 19th May. The Parish Council agree in principle for the need of new housing in the village, but have concerns over the potential size of a new development as suggested in the Local Plan. The land shown as plot 104 in the plan with the potential for 53 homes has listed buildings in situ, which we could not agree to being removed. Wissett is a rural village of some 131 dwellings with a population of circa 268. The addition of the potential 53 new homes would therefore increase the amount of homes by some 40%, and assuming an average of 3 people in each new home, a population increase of around 60%. We do not believe that this would be either sustainable, or in keeping with the village profile. Roads to access and through, the village are also narrow and we currently experience traffic flow of around 34,000 vehicles per month through The Street, as recorded by our VAS equipment in April 2016. Wissett has no facilities, other than a pub. There are no shops and no public transport. There are very few safe hard paths, limited lighting, no on road parking, only a small car park (at the opposite end of the village). Halesworth is over a mile away with no hard paths to walk there, so a car is essential. Halesworth Surgery is already busy, the hospital is marked for closure, and there is no secondary school, only a small junior school. Any proposed development should be small (i.e. similar to Farm Close), and must have adequate off road parking for the home owners, and visitors, vehicles. It should also have an open area for play etc, as walking on the narrow road to the village field may be dangerous. Access to the site would also have to be looked at i.e. off of The Street or Mill Road. The Street is already busy as indicated above, and Mill Road is very narrow with few passing places. We believe that major road and footpath improvements would have to be made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Potential land for development 106 - Land to north of 34-48 Old Station Road, Halesworth**

**Edward Barnaby Milburn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 106 - Land to north of 34-48 Old Station Road, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Comment ID | 1193

**Comment**
The sites further north 106,140,141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town.  
There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 106 - Land to north of 34-48 Old Station Road, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Wissett Hall grade II to north west. Potential impact on setting of Listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 106 - Land to north of 34-48 Old Station Road, Halesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 106; 140; 141 the creation of 87 houses lacks adequate infrastructure on Wissett Road leading to Norwich Road, the narrowest junction in Halesworth, with the danger of increased traffic bordering the Edgar Sewter School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 107 - Land to the east of London Road, Weston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The corridor adjacent to the Beccles Relief Road should only be developed for housing on a limited scale ie. not all the sites listed should be identified for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential land for development 108 - Land to the east of London Road (south of John Lawrence Close), Beccles

**Beccles Town Council C Boyne**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 108 - Land to the east of London Road (south of John Lawrence Close), Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

Whilst the council appreciate the need for development in the area over the next twenty years, it must be handled with great care as the infrastructure in Beccles is at breaking point now, especially the Health Centre. With this in mind, it is felt that any housing development should be restricted to the area to the South West on one or two of the sites numbered 24, 43, 108, 145 and 156, as this makes the best use of the existing and planned road infrastructure. However, this area would require a new primary school and a convenience store and other associated infrastructure to service any expansion. In addition, the two small sites in Beccles, numbers 1 and 16 and site number 60 in Worlingham could also be included as sites for development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 108 - Land to the east of London Road (south of John Lawrence Close), Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>As I said earlier, I am not against Beccles having new affordable homes and bungalows however these need to be built in manageable sizes around the periphery of the town and brown field sites such as plot 16 (24 homes) in the town centre and plots 156 (260 homes), 43 (40 homes), 108 (49 homes) all along a current main road, where there is currently little development and not feeding into the current traffic hot spots which is Ingate Street/Lowestoft Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential land for development 109 - Land to the North of 109 London Road, Kessingland

**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 109 - Land to the North of 109 London Road, Kessingland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Adjacent to Pond Farmhouse grade II listed to north. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jo Thompson

Section: Potential land for development 109 - Land to the North of 109 London Road, Kessingland

Comment ID: 63

Comment: This is an initial response on seeing the plans for the former Ashley's site in London Road.
I am alarmed to see that the plan shows this potential development to the west of London Rd as well as the east. The small parcel of land between 109 London road and Pond Farm is NOT part of the former Ashley's site and is not Brown Field land. This small parcel of land is still owned by the family that held the parcel of land including Ashley's and Pond Farm. It is the only piece of land they still retain.
Until ten years ago it was a horse pasture and prior to that a Market Garden. It has never been brown field.
Ten years ago the family discontinued care of the land and left it to grow wild. In that time it has become a nature reserve and provides valuable nesting habitat for many species of birds (a colony of Linnets has established there and is increasing), Plus ground cover for wildlife, including deer, hedgehogs, snakes, weasels and voles.
The development of the former Ashley's site is included in our village plan but the small parcel of land opposite to the west of London Road has never been part of that plan.
I object very strenuously to any plan to build on this land and am hoping that its inclusion in the plan is a mistake as in times gone by it was under the same ownership as Ashley's (but not by Ashley's).
I should declare at this time that I am also Parish Councillor in Kessingland, although this response is entirely as a resident living adjacent to this piece of land.
Jo Thompson

Potential land for development 109 - Land to the North of 109 London Road, Kessingland

Comment ID: 481

Comment: Further to my initial comments on this site.
This site has been neglected by the owner for over a decade. The owner is not a local resident.
Neighbours on both sides of the property have voluntarily undertaken maintenance to prevent growth spreading beyond its boundaries. The accidental result of this is that the land has become a haven for wildlife and a very beautiful meadow.
To the north of the land is a grade II listed building (Pond Farm) which has been lovingly restored by its owners, including an extensive pond, that is a valuable asset to the heritage of the village. It value and beauty would be considerably diminished by building to its boundaries.
In the past, adjoining neighbours to the land have attempted to engage with the owner to discuss buying, renting or managing the piece of land.
The owner has not engaged with us (beyond legal warning letters about trespass) and clearly has no interest other than obtaining change of use and selling at development prices.
I appreciate this is within the owner’s rights but it is not in the interest of the neighbourhood and village.
It is green belt land and forms a valuable part of the ‘strategic gap’ between Kessingland and Pakefield/Lowestoft.
Any development there would have no requirement to provide affordable homes which are the only homes needed in Kessingland and would not add anything to the infrastructure or sustainability of the village.
On a purely personal note, as the adjacent owner to the south of the land, the boundary is one metre from my north facing windows. My west facing and north facing windows are currently looking onto open land and are not overlooked. Any building would significantly impact on my privacy and (probably) my light.
I strongly object to any building on this land.
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section  
Potential land for development 109 - Land to the North of 109 London Road, Kessingland

Comment ID  
987

Comment  
With regards to site 85 (Rider Haggard Lane), site 109 (London Road) and sites 119 and 125 (Church Road) – none of the landowners came forward during the 4 years that the Neighbourhood Plan has been in progress, except the owner of sites 119 and 125 (part of these sites are being used as allotments), who stated that they didn't want to be part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. These two sites which are south of Church Road are part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) bordering the Kessingland Levels, and are not sites suitable for development.

Excluding site 41, which has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan, these 4 sites in total would bring forward 100 homes.

The Neighbourhood Plan, which is as a result of 4 years consultation with landowners and the local community brings forward 3 sites which would bring forward a total of 105 homes plus in the case of site SA1 a commercial incubator facility, in respect of site SA2 a new playing field recreation area extension and in the case of SA3 affordable homes held in perpetuity for the residents of Kessingland.

Therefore the 4 sites put forward in the Waveney Local Plan are considered to be surplus to the requirements of Kessingland, the 'Housing Needs Survey' figures are more than covered by the Neighbourhood Plan proposals, which should be included in the Waveney Local Plan in preference to the other sites put forward.
Mary Hill

Section
Potential land for development 109 - Land to the North of 109 London Road, Kessingland

Comment ID
101

Comment
Having bought a Grade 2 listed building, Pond Farm, from the owner of this patch of land 26 years ago, we were promised that the remainder of the site would not be put up for redevelopment. We have only just found out that this is no longer the case and that planning permission is being sought for the development of 10 houses. All three of the neighbours, each side and opposite are very angry that this has happened, and hope that you see sense in not approving this application. This would also be breaking the Strategic Gap that we were promised would not be broken when we first arrived in Kessingland. We spent a lot of money and time restoring our 400 year old house, and DO NOT want it surrounded by new modern housing. Kessingland Parish Council are also totally against this.

Mary Hill
Mary Hill

Potential land for development 109 - Land to the North of 109 London Road, Kessingland

Comment ID 508

Comment

I have commented on this already, but am shocked to find that the owner, the grandson of the person that we bought our Grade 11 listed building Pond Farm from is trying to obtain building consent on this piece of land. When we bought this property 26 years ago it was all part of the Ashley Garden Centre site, and the owner promised that the piece of land in question would remain a green field site as it is in the Strategic Gap between Kessingland and Pakefield. We have spent much time and money restoring our 350 year old house and outbuildings to their former glory and would not wish to be surrounded by modern properties. Kessingland Council feel the same. Our neighbours at 109 London Road, and ourselves have always maintained the hedgerow and grass verges on London Road, and obviously kept our boundaries tidy. This piece of land has now become a haven for wildlife and we would wish it to remain the same.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 109 - Land to the North of 109 London Road, Kessingland

Comment ID 765

Comment Based on aerial photographs, sites 41; 85; 109 and 119 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.
Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Andrew Burton and Myrtle Boon

Section

Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 363

Comment

We wish to strongly object to Site No. 110 as a potential building plot for 70 properties in Black Street, Gisleham, our reasons being:

• The 2.3 hectare plot is described on your website as shrub and overgrown, this statement is not accurate, older residents of Black Street will confirm that the field directly behind Latymere Close has been under annual cultivation for the last 60 years. The small plot sited in a sand pit at the top of Sandy Lane is overgrown and was possibly looked at by your building inspector

• There are 60 properties at the northern end of Black Street; the addition of 70 new homes would spoil the character in this peaceful Hamlet.

• Access on Black Street is restricted and poor, both ends are only one vehicle wide, over the section of the road in front of the development vehicles can only pass with care.

• The increase in traffic using Black Street will more than double the number of vehicles using the road. HGV, delivery vehicles and cars are often parked in Black Street through necessity although the road is not suitable; this causes problems with HGVs and farm machinery when negotiating the street. Damage to fencing, hedgerows and brick walls is a constant problem due to heavy vehicles trying to negotiate the road.

• Surface water from surrounding fields and properties drains into and along Black Street; flooding the road is well documented causing damage to properties and gardens, the existing drains have proved inadequate during times of heavy and persistent rain fall. Water runoff from any development will only exacerbate the problem.

• The present traffic load has caused the road surface to subside in places due to increase in size of farm machinery and HGVs using the road in recent times, this subsidence has attributed to the flooding as surface water has not been running into the drains.

• The sewage pumping station in Black Street has in the past proved
inadequate and has caused gardens on the south/east side of the road to be flooded with raw sewage.

• Black Street and the properties on the south/east side of the road are on a flood plain and properties and gardens have been flooded (reflected in increases in insurance premiums) during periods of persistent rain.

• There are no footpaths in Black Street. Local residents and school children walk and cycle along the road; it is also popular with hikers, horse riders and pony and traps and dog-walkers.

• There is no gas supply or fibre Optic broadband available

• There would be considerable light pollution from the new street lighting

• At certain times of the day Strobing (light flicker) from the wind Turbine affects residents along Black Street as well as the noise as the nearest Turbine is only 600 metres distance.

We hope you will agree that this site is not suitable for development as part of the Waveney Local Plan.
Anthony Gower

Section Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 260

Comment Site 110 – Land to the North of Black Street
I consider this site unsuitable for housing development, the proposed purpose, and request it is removed from the list of potential land for development.

The site itself is predominantly a gently sloping field, plus a former sand pit. It is bounded to the North by a row of mature trees, and to the South by Black Street, at which point it is roughly 2 metres above street level. At the lower end of this bank there is a small, narrow, and unused access point, current vehicular entry being via the neighbouring field to the North. The field itself is bisected by power lines. I suggest it is the poor access, comparatively small size, and presence of power lines, making it difficult to farm on a desired scale is the reason the owner has proposed it for housing. Again, at the lowest point(west) it adjoins the boundary of the AONB where the site provides a wildlife corridor.

It would be difficult to envisage how safe access to the proposed site would be achieved. Black Street is narrow and meandering throughout, and with a considerable number of pinch points. In spite of that it is a thoroughfare, and has been used as a "rat run" on numerous occasions when the A12 has been closed, with chaotic consequences.

There is no gas supply to Black Street, and unlikely ever to be. Many homeowners rely on bulk fuel deliveries(predominantly oil), and it must be assumed that would extend to any future development. For existing properties this often results in the road being blocked during such deliveries, to which should be added refuse collection.

The section of Black Street forming the Southern boundary of the site is currently included in the Flood Warning Area(Flood Zone 3), with sections either side identified at high risk of flooding from surface water, potentially preventing access. The current drainage system struggles to cope with such surface water, yet it would be into that system that any captured water would flow, plus the significantly increased run-off from the proposed site. Because of its low-lying position Black Street relies on a pumped sewage system, which struggles to cope with existing demand. The pumping station itself is in the flood risk zone, and that risk, and the flooding risk in general, will increase substantially under the current Shoreline Management Plan,
i.e. The abandonment of the pumping station at Benacre Ness, allowing the land South of Black Street to become vulnerable to sea ingress.

Two wind turbines sited to the East of Black Street cause considerable problems for existing residents. Waveney DC have failed to tackle many of the issues of concern. The one area of success has been in addressing Shadow Flicker, requiring the turbines to be stopped during times of risk. Residents at the proposed site would encounter the same problems currently experienced, placing more pressure on the Authority, whilst requiring further reduction in the generating potential of the turbines. Black Street currently has about 40 properties. 70 more would almost treble that figure. In spite of that there are no local facilities, unless you include a postbox, and telephone kiosk (without a phone), and certainly no public transport. It may be in Gisleham, but the nearest facilities are in Kessingland. It is there that residents turn for shops, pubs, doctors, libraries etc. More importantly it is Kessingland that provides primary education for the youngest in society. Although poor, street lighting exists along the route to that local school. A primary school does exist in the parish, but it has now become the replacement for the one in Carlton Colville. Furthermore, it is over 2 miles away, along an unlit country lane.

The proposed development would place further pressure on services in Kessingland, which is already struggling to cope. I find it distasteful and unethical that this proposed development could potentially impact significantly on those local services, without Kessingland Parish Council having any direct involvement. It is worth remembering that it was only a few years ago that proposed boundary changes would have placed Black Street in Norfolk, but with Kessingand remaining in Suffolk. How this would have affected services for residents was unclear, but it is certain they would not have improved, and there is nothing to say this idea will not rear its head again.

With so few existing properties housing need cannot possibly exist on the scale proposed.

To quote from your document: -
"In reviewing the Local Plan, we need to consider what villages are the most suitable to accommodate new development over the next 20 years. Some of the things necessary to consider will be, existing settlement size, provision and accessibility to services and facilities, transport infrastructure and housing need. Good transport is key to successful places"

The proposed development fails all these tests.

In conclusion, Black Street is what it is. It is not perfect. It lacks amenities, maintenance is poor, with overgrown verges, narrow, with poor sight lines. There are no facilities for children, and under constant threat of flooding. It
is a rural hamlet of mixed housing capable of satisfying its own needs. The proposed development would quite simply overwhelm it, not only to the detriment of existing residents but also to new arrivals. It would be a recipe for disaster, not a natural one, but one endorsed by the Local Authority. Mitigation would require infrastructure expenditure on a scale out of all proportion, the cost of which would be met from the general public, not the owner or potential developer. The owner may wish to profit from the site but I doubt many developers would be interested. With a view over the marshes of the AONB interest is likely to centre, not on affordable housing on the scale proposed, but on a lower number of up-market properties. That would immediately denigrate the contribution of the site to a new local plan that must have as its premise need not greed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barry Roberts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beverley O'Keefe

Section  Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID  899

Comment  Regarding the above proposal, I wish to forward my views on why they should not be built on this site.

1. Black Street is in a designated area of flood risk. When we do get heavy rain the water very soon blocks drain and rushes down Sandy Lane depositing the silt and debris at the bottom and soon blocks drainage.

2. The services and facilities are already overloaded and wouldn't be able to cope ie sewage mainly.

3. Accessibility – these lanes are very narrow - with the house walls directly on the road. This is an agricultural area where lorries and tractors are rushing along Black Street constantly. The vehicles needed to build these homes along with possibly as many as a 100 more cars would not only be hazardous, but also cause pollution and danger to the houses and residents. The children who attend the Leman School walk daily to and fro to the bus on the road, there are no footpaths. There have already been 'near misses' as the modern driver does not drive too carefully!

4. Sandy Lane, off Black Street, is an unadopted lane one way with an ex-sandpit at the top. The lane itself is so narrow that 2 cars cannot pass and when it rains the water and debris pours down, again, blocking the drain. The sandpit itself is home to a large badger sett. Badgers are protected mammals and should not be disturbed. There are also owls, foxes and muntjacs in the vicinity. I have informed Suffolk Wildlife Society of the sett.

5. Facilities and services – we have little here but the basics, no bus service, and after having suffered months putting up with erection, road closure etc whilst the wind turbine were erected. The homeowners especially in Latymere (ex-council) would be open to water and pollution from these houses as Latymere is below the field.

Of course our properties would drop in value, which would be obvious, through no fault of ours.

New houses should be built on brownfield sites such as Ellough airfield, where the main road through to Beccles and the A12 is comparatively wide and accessible compared to Black Street, which is narrow and windy and has only the Rushmere village one end and the Snab Hill the other.

I conclude with the main points against: flooding, accessibility, safety with pollution caused by cars etc., services (sewage), and Sandy Lane Badger sett
(protected species).
**Brian Soloman**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

**Comment ID**  
220

**Comment**  
This Site is not suitable for 70 properties because of access roads which are too narrow for the increased traffic levels that would be generated. The services, sewerage and water would be seriously stretched; local services such as schools and medical facilities are already inadequate and the increased population would severely affect this small rural hamlet.

I would have no objection to a much smaller development on the land between Century House and Latymer Close, say ten properties as "infill" development.

Black street suffers greatly when major accidents occur on the A12 which necessitates using the road as a diversion and residents have great difficulty in using the road when Dustcarts, tractors, tankers and delivery lorries are around. This gives an idea of what it would be like to have 70 new properties in this country hamlet. I would respectfully suggest other sites may be more suitable.
Bruce and Jenny Francis

Section Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 658

Comment As a resident of Black Street, Gisleham, it has been brought to my attention that you are proposing to initiate the building of approximately 70 homes on the land adjacent to Latymere Close.
I feel it necessary to write to you in this regard as I am concerned the plot and the area you have 'zoned' for this size of development is totally inadequate.
The main points I would think that would deem this plan as totally unacceptable are as follows:
* Drainage of this size development. What is already in place doesn’t cope.
* Access to the hamlet is extremely narrow - any additional numbers of traffic just wouldn’t be possible.
* Communication links including transport/internet/telephone are already maxed.
* Potential increase in children. Local schools are already overloaded - we are just trying to get a pre-school place and not succeeding.
* Major disruption to the local environment for the construction of such a development.
These are to name just a few issues with the proposal. I would strongly recommend a team of knowledgeable and practical persons to simply come and do a 'site visit' as I can promise you it will be very obvious from a simple visit to Black Street that a development of anything over just a handful of properties is absolutely ridiculous and totally detrimental to the whole surrounding area in every way.
For the safety and security of the residents in the Black Street area I would ask you to reconsider.
Bruce Provan

Section  
Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID  
535

Comment  
Gisleham is a relatively small settlement which would be swamped with a development like this. The roads are also inadequate.
Charles Barker

Section Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 647

Comment Black Street is a very narrow country lane where two vehicles cannot pass safely without one pulling over. School children walking to the bus stop for the school bus have no footpaths and any future development could possibly add one hundred and fifty cars into the area (on the basis of 70 new houses, as suggested.)

The elevated, sloping site means hard surfacing will cause drainage problems, properties on the opposite (lower) side would suffer. The sewage system, already at full capacity would need to be upgraded with a contingency plan for breakdown, with backdrop construction due to the elevation.

There is an overhead electricity supply which is also likely to need updating. Contractors vehicles and equipment would be chaotic, causing mud on the surrounding roads as we have experienced from farm traffic in past years.

For the houses on the lower side of the road the proposed development would be an intrusion of privacy. This site is totally unsuitable for housing expansion - no public transport, shops, or medical facilities which are not already straining to cope.

Apart from practical considerations, there is a magnificent row of ancient oak trees that overlook the hamlet of Black Street from the rear of the proposed site, and give the area its identity. These should not be sacrificed in the interests of this proposal.

Consideration should be given to the residents of this area, as well as the long term detrimental effects on the surrounding countryside.
I refer to your recent publication "Options for the new Waveney Local Plan" dated April 2016 and, in particular, the proposals for Site Number 110, Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham. Your proposal states that this land will be suitable for housing development with an indicative number of 70 houses on this site. I would make the following comments on this proposal:

1. Black Street is currently a very rural community with 65 houses. Adding another 70 houses, as indicated in your Local Plan, will result in an additional 140 adults, at least, and potentially 150 or more children. While the overall population of Gisleham is of the order of 780 in some 330 dwellings, Black Street is a separate community with a population of approximately 170 residents. The proposed increase in the number of residents from the new housing development would utterly change - and not necessarily for the better - the character of this community; a consequence you need to address in your deliberations.

2. Black Street is a single carriageway road with no pavements and the children from our community have to walk to the north-eastern end of the street to await their school buses. The increase in traffic during the construction period would bring unacceptable risk of injury or worse to these children as they go to and from school while the construction traffic tries to gain access to the building site. Living at the north-eastern end of Black Street, I can see no easy solution to providing pavements to help segregate pedestrians and traffic. As there is no space available for the provision of pavements, it follows that the risk of serious injury or death to residents from the increased traffic flow would be unacceptably high.

3. The initial impact of this development would be a considerable increase in construction traffic through Black Street. This would include personal transport for the construction workers, delivery vans and lorries, possibly including articulated trucks. While this might be considered a "short term" activity, such activity is likely to take at least 18 months and would seriously affect the safety of pedestrians walking along the verges of the road.

4. I raise a similar concern once all of the 70 new houses are occupied. Public transport is not available within or close to Black Street; consequently, all the new residents would require their own means of transport to get to and from work and to and from the shops. This would
result in an additional 100 to 200 cars, maybe more. Again, road safety, especially for pedestrians and cyclists, become an important issue.

5 The street lighting is currently sparse in Black Street. With an increased number of children needing to walk to and from the school bus pick-up and drop-off point, there is increased potential, or injury, especially during hours of reduced visibility and darkness. This is likely to be an issue both during the construction period and once the new occupants have taken up residence. While increased street lighting may reduce the risk of accidents between road traffic and pedestrians, the lack of space available for the construction of pavements remains a prime concern.

6 Black Street is currently a narrow road and the width allows only a single vehicle to pass in a number of places. At present, the road can cope with the current number of motor vehicles that use it. Increasing the number of vehicles that need to gain access to the new houses, as described above, would cause excessive traffic flows and bad feeling among residents, both old and new. It would appear, therefore, that width of Black Street and its lack of pavements will make this new housing development untenable.

Should you propose, however, to continue with this housing development, serious attention must be given to the resulting traffic flows in the area.

7 In addition to point 6 above, the traffic flows from the new housing development would need to use the local roads, i.e. the continuation of Black Street to Rushmere, a single track road, the roads to the centre of Gisleham and onwards to Carlton Colville and the road into Mutford, all of which are narrow in places. How would your development plan address the impact of the increase in traffic on these roads and how would you alleviate the congestion which would undoubtedly arise?

8 From the Local Plan, it appears that Sandy Lane would be one of the main access roads to the new development. Currently, this is a single track, unadopted road with no space for pavements. While another access point is clearly visible on the plans, please will you explain how Sandy Lane would be made suitable for a significant increase of traffic to and from the new housing area.

9 Given the increase in private vehicles that will be required by the new residents, as detailed in point 3 above, the issue arises about off-street parking for these additional vehicles. All of the houses in Black Street currently have facilities for off-street parking. I have noticed that many of the new housing developments in and around Lowestoft do not have sufficient off-street parking areas with the result that tars are parked on pavements and roads, leading to congestion and frustration for residents. In the Village Profile for Gisleham, I notice that the number of cars per dwelling is 1.5, while the similar figure for adjacent parishes can be as high
as 1. 7. Given the lack of Public Transport facilities in Black Street, will you explain how the anticipated number of cars per dwelling will be determined for this new development and how, as a minimum, this number of vehicles will be accommodated in off-street parking?

10 I now come on to the issues associated with the provision of housing services, water, sewerage, electrical power and telephone and internet connections. Please advise how a doubling of water demand from the new housing development will be addressed. The current piping system is suitable for the 65 houses currently in Black Street, but would certainly be insufficient for an additional 70 houses. Also, the current sewerage facilities are almost at full capacity. There have been several occasions when the main sewer in Black Street has become blocked with waste water filling up the sewer upstream of the blockage and resulting in foul water discharging from manholes and open drains and even into household toilets. In addition, the capacity of the sewerage pumping station in Black Street is at its limit, as is the capacity of the Kessingland Sewerage Works, to which the sewage is pumped. Have the costs for increasing the capacity of these vital systems has been included in your estimates for the additional 70 houses?

11 I am not aware of any current problems with the supply of electrical power to the properties in Black Street, nor with the provision of telecommunications and internet connections. Doubling the demand for these services, however, is likely to bring a reduction in capacity to the existing residents. Please explain how these services will be maintained without unacceptable loss of voltage or reduction in speed of internet connections should the new housing development be approved.

12 With the new housing development being proposed on land that is higher than Black Street itself, there is increased likelihood that, during or following a heavy rain storm, the rainwater run-off from the new housing development will run into Black Street and cause flooding to existing low-lying houses. This happened in 1995. With the new housing development occupying land that would otherwise absorb rainfall, increased rainwater run-off will occur with a significantly increased risk of flooding; a major concern for the current residents. This, clearly, is not acceptable. Therefore, please advise whether plans and costs for the installation and maintenance of a rainwater run-off catchment system has been included in your estimates.

Given the above concerns, it is clear to me that the proposed housing development for Black Street Gisleham should not be considered further; there are many other areas identified within the Local Development Plan that can more easily accommodate new housing. I am of the opinion that
the overall impact of the new housing proposal to be unsafe for the existing and new residents and therefore should not be considered further.
CM & RG Dexter

Section  Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID  359

Comment  Please find enclosed our appraisal of site option 110 land to the north of black street Gisleham

SMALL PLOT TO NORTH
Redundant sand pit
High unsupported sides
Loose sand bottom
Access none only by driving on or crossing public footpath
Wildlife habitat currently supports Badgers
Footpath currently well used by local villagers
No reasonable place to divert

LARGER PLOT
Poor access to site
Road width at proposed site 16ft
Limited scope to widen road as several houses built to road edge
No kerbs for pedestrians and children walking to school bus
Road width south of site Black Street 12ft max no scope to widen on blind bend with mature oak one side and driveway on other
Road width north of site Black Street 12ft.max very little scope to widen as houses in that area very close to road
Road on site frontage at present on medium flood risk [se EA website]
Site still suffers from noise and strobbing from wind turbines problem still not resolved by W D C despite many complaints

SERVICES
Sewer system may not coop with an additional 70 houses
Rapidly floods into gardens on east side of black street following breakdown of pumping system with current numbers
System at medium risk of flooding from north sea se E A website
Should Benacre Ness pumping station become breached risk will probably be raised to HIGH
PUBLIC TRANSPORT none
STREET CLEANING none
POLICING rare
STREET LIGHTING very poor

OVERALL APPRAISEL OF PROPOSED SITE
Adding more than double the number of current houses with a potential for 140 more cars using a narrow road no footpaths no public transport and a large increase recently in farm traffic very large tractors on very narrow road which is so narrow in places two vehicles cannot pass is madness and a great danger to children and parents who currently walk to the school. In view of the enclosed points it is our opinion that this site is not suitable for such a large scale development.
Dave Woods

Section  
Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID  
244

Comment  
I am very concerned about the proposal to site a possible 70 houses on site 110. Several issues. Currently the road is very narrow and has no pavements, this road already provides access for the 60 houses of Black street and can be hazardous to pedestrians, dog walkers and children walking to and from school (or to the bus pick up point on Snab hill. More houses means more traffic, more walkers and more children NOT GOOD! It wont be long before someone gets hurt. Street lighting in the area is at best very poor. The area on the opposite side of Black street already has issue with excess water and drainage systems that are unable to cope, having a concrete jungle of houses will only make matters worse, following heavy rain all that surface water has to go somewhere and unless dramatic changes to Black street drainage and of course Kessingland reception/drainage the original houses will no doubt have flooding issues. There are no services in black street, no shops or amenities of any sort, All our services come from Kessingland. People will tend to use cars just to use these amenities which will of course cause a black street to became a busy access road, as previously stated due to the width and lack of pavement/curbs etc of the road this will become a hazardous route for pedestrians. I am sure there are some wildlife issues here too but as yet I need to find out. Regards, Dave Woods & Hayley Comer.
Dean and Julie Hitcham

Section Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 905

Comment I am writing with regards to the potential land for development in Black Street, Gisleham. Ref plot 110 as shown in the ‘New Waveney Local Development Plan’.

Black Street is a small hamlet of around sixty dwellings. The proposal of 70 new homes would more than double the housing in this area.

The road is at best is sixteen feet wide and narrows to around twelve feet at its entrance from Snab Hill to the north. Seventy more houses could bring a hundred or more cars using the road daily as well as extra service vehicles on what is in effect just a narrow country road.

There is little or no scope for widening, no kerbs and no pavements. This makes for hazardous walking, especially for the school children who are required to walk to the end of the road to catch the school bus. Some of the houses are within a couple of feet of the road and a few have had problems with vehicles knocking into them.

The actual site is a good ten feet higher than the road and has been in constant agricultural use for over sixty years. It is currently sown with a crop of rapeseed and certainly not overgrown and unused as stated in your site appraisal document. It would need extensive excavations to prevent new buildings from towering over the existing houses opposite. There is also a row of mature oak trees that could suffer damage as a result of excavations.

Black Street has long suffered from poor sewer and drainage. Surface water and mud run off from the surrounding fields and certain parts of the road are prone to large puddles of water. A raised development would mean more surface water running into the road and onto the properties opposite.

Houses on the east side of the road are classed by the Environment Agency as being at medium risk from coastal flooding and are built on a designated flood plain. Notice has been given in the past to evacuate during high tidal surges and with current plans not to maintain the pumping station at Benacre, this may become a more frequent event in the future. Flood maps show the road will flood to the north and south of the site completely cutting it off.

Residents of Black Street suffer constant noise from the two wind turbines
situated in Kessingland with strobing and shadow flicker being a problem in the winter months. The site lays right in the middle of the area that is worst affected by this. These are issues that are still ongoing and unresolved.

Public services are non-existent, there are no buses, bad street lighting and nominal visible policing. In addition the road is constantly used by heavy farm vehicles and agricultural machinery.

The small site at the top of Sandy Lane is a disused sandpit with a well used public footpath running alongside it and no public right of way access. It is also inhabited by a group of badgers who I believe are protected by an act of law.

I would most earnestly urge you to consider these issues when deciding if this potential site is suitable for development.
G.M. Phillips

Section: Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID: 681

Comment: I am objecting to the plans to build houses in black street and up sandy lane Gisleham. The reasons are Black street can not handle the increase in traffic, the sewage system would not handle it. It's in a flood plain already also there are badges in the sand pit at the top of sandy lane. Also, public transport is non-existent over crowding at the local school and doctors to name a few.
Gisleham Parish Council Derek Ward

Section
Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID
428

Comment
Following an open meeting held by Gisleham Parish Council on Tuesday 24 May, Councillors would like to make the following observations and objections to the possible allocation of land for the development of 70 dwellings at the above sites. It is our opinion that, should this development be approved in its current form, the proposed scale of the development would totally alter the rural character of Black Street. Currently there are 62 properties; to add 70 further properties would more than double the population and take away the peaceful atmosphere of this rural area. It would also exacerbate the current problems in Black Street listed below

1) ROAD - The road width at the proposed possible entrance to the site is 4.8 m which is barely wide enough to allow two cars to pass safely notwithstanding the regular use of the road by large farm traffic; refuse and delivery vehicles and horse riders. There is no space for widening the road because of adjacent front gardens, driveways and hedgerows. A number of properties on Black Street front directly onto the road and do not have the benefit of front gardens as a buffer zone.

2) FOOTPATH - There are no footpaths along the road and no space to create any. Pedestrians have to walk along this very narrow road when leaving the village. It is therefore of huge concern that their safety will be greatly endangered, particularly taking into consideration the use of the road by the construction traffic and the vastly increased local traffic should these 70 dwellings be constructed.

3) FLOODING - Black Street has been subject to surface water flooding several times over the last few years. Bearing in mind climate change with the resultant heavy rains, the road is likely to be flooded on a more frequent basis. It is noted that the proposed site slopes toward the road and, therefore, any surface water will run down to the road causing widespread water on the road which is likely to result in water damage and disruption to properties on the eastern side of the carriageway. Latymere Close properties will also suffer from surface water run off from the proposed site.

4) SEWERAGE - The existing sewerage system is struggling at present to cope with the current demands and it is probable that it would be totally inadequate for a new upgrade on this site without a very expensive
upgrade. The existing pumping station is already working to full capacity and would also struggle to handle any further development. The existing system has suffered blockages in recent years, which has resulted in sewage leaking from various inspection chambers.

5) INFRASTRUCTURE - There is no public transport and no local shopping facility within the Black Street area and we feel that this would inevitably increase the amount of traffic using the road. The school at Kessingland which is now an Academy currently has 247 pupils. Parking at this location is very limited and could become more of a problem to the local community with a significant rise in pupils. If some parents decide to send their children to Carlton Colville Primary School which is near capacity now, this will cause even more problems with the severe issues of car parking that are currently being experienced. The GP surgery would have to cope with 150 or more new patients. In our opinion this would not be acceptable for the existing number of GP’s and the size of surgery or location where parking is already quite difficult.

6) ENVIRONMENT - We estimate that the construction period for a development of this size would be somewhere in the region of 18 months. Bearing in mind our earlier comments it is felt this is totally unacceptable in a rural area; including the inevitable damage that it could cause to the environment and the existing road surface. There will also be a significant impact to local residents from noise pollution created by the various contractors and increased traffic.

6) LIGHTING - The current street lighting along Black Street is adequate for the existing residents and its rural location but would not be suitable for a larger population. However, should this be increased to cater for a new development of this size there is the likelihood that it would create environmental problems with a significant increase in light pollution. Additional lighting on the site would also exacerbate any light pollution in this rural setting.

7) SMALLER SITE OFF SANDY LANE - this small site has no adequate access and is a disused sand pit and a natural habitat for various types of wildlife including a population of badgers. In view of this, we are strongly against any development of this area and feel it should be left for this purpose. In view of the foregoing, Councillors request that these objections are very carefully considered and taken into account when this parcel of land comes before your department for consideration.

Please do not hesitate to contact us should wish any further clarification on the points raised.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Historic England Debbie Mack</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Rookery Farm grade II listed farmhouse approximately 200 metre to west. Potential impact upon setting of Listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ian Cook

Section: Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID: 673

Comment: I am writing to you with reference to the proposal for building of new properties on the land identified in Black Street Gisleham. I am not in agreement for the proposal in the given location for the below stated reasons.

1. Access – Black street access from Snab Hill is at best a single track route. Given the limited number of current residential properties the road can be dangerous turning in from Snab Hill due to restricted vision and areas to pass (unable to pass 2 vehicles along large sections of the road). At certain times of the day and year this becomes even more so with heavy plant and lorries servicing the farm. The road is also frequently used for dog walking, running and general access and with no footpaths poses a potential hazard with further traffic. The proposal of circa 70 additional properties with an average of 2 vehicles per household makes this a serious concern and increased hazard.

2. Services (Electric) – Black street is fed via overhead power cables. It is common for the properties in the area to suffer power cuts in adverse weather. It is believed that the supply to the area would not withstand further building without serious upgrading.

3. Services (Gas) – Black street has no mains gas supply. All properties are either oil, solid fuel or electric.

4. Services (sewage) – Black street sewage system has suffered a number of leaks and problems over the past few years. Could the mains sewer take the proposal without a full system upgrade?

5. Services (Broadband) – Black street broadband service is yet to be upgraded to fibre. Currently not stable or suitable for the existing properties.

6. Services (street lighting) – Black Street has very limited street lighting. Potential issue area should further properties be built with a large increase in people leaving in the area.

7. Service (Kessingland sluice) – The current sluice at Benacre is flood prevention for the river hundred. It is getting closer to the sea due to erosion and if ceases to function in the coming years will result in flooding to marshland around Black street. Further development will also add additional threat to this.
8. Potential Flooding – Properties on the east side of Black street suffer flooding during adverse weather. Should properties be built in proposed area this could result in torrents of water running from the proposed site onto these low lying properties causing further flooding risk.

9. Wind Turbines – Current wind turbines in Kessingland cause shadow flicker at certain times of the year. Properties on the proposed site would be subject to this phenomenon which is a very unpleasant experience. Council are aware and have not addressed this issue since installation of the turbines (have video evidence should you wish to see this!!!)

10. Wildlife – Black street area is a hive of wildlife. The proposed site is home to badgers, owls, deer and a number of bird breeds that are not seen in other local areas. Building on the site would disrupt and potential drive away the wildlife that has been living in this area.

11. Local Amenities (Schools) – Local schools are often oversubscribed and further properties in this area will result in overloads on the local schools causing either overcrowded classes resulting in worse ofsted reports or additional transport costs to less crowded schools around the Lowestoft area (example my daughter was placed in East point academy due to current oversubscription of high schools).

12. Local Amenities (Doctors Surgery) – Kessingland is the local doctors surgery. It is often very difficult to obtain an appointment to see a GP as this is a relatively small surgery. A potential for circa 280 additional people would not be supported by this surgery.

13. Local Amenities (Bus Routes) – No local bus route supporting Black Street. Kessingland is the nearest serviceable bus stop.

14. Local Amenities (Policing) – No local police servicing the area.

15. Local People – Area has a number of elderly people and young children. A number of children walk to the end of the road daily to catch school buses. Lack of paths with increase in road traffic will make this a hazard with potential to cause harm. Likewise elderly people walk to road to meet others and walk to kessingland. They face the same potential to cause harm with increased traffic.

16. Noise – Black street is a very quite rural area. An increase in property will remove this from the current tranquil area and disturb the habitats for the wildlife mentioned above.

With the above points to note I am against the proposal for development. I believe there are other areas with far safer access and egress that make these a better proposition than the Black Street proposal. The potential to cause harm with increased traffic and cars (potentially circa 140 cars) would render the road a real hazard to all that walk or drive through. A single track lane is not suitable to support an increase in property as per proposal. It
must also be noted that Snab Hill is not suitable for 2 cars to pass in certain areas and again is not suitable for an increase in traffic.
I hope the above points will be given serious consideration prior to any further submission proposals.
Jamie O’Keefe

Section Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 679

Comment I am writing to you concerning the proposed development of Black Street, Gisleham with an extension of upwards of 70 new properties, I want to register my opposition to this proposal, as I feel the size of the development is unsustainable given the very limited access to the site from both Latimer Drive and Sandy Lane. Neither route offers sufficient access to any substantial increase in road traffic, being far to narrow and in Sandy Lanes case in particular cluttered with parked vehicles to permit an increase in what already passes along these routes, I feel it would substantially degrade the quality of life of the residents and pose a risk to residents safety as there are no foot paths currently available and no space to add them.

I also feel that the proposed development would significantly increase the risk of flooding in the village due to water run off from what is a sloping site that would if built upon lack the natural soak away property’s of open ground, we already have a flooding problem in the lower village and fields. Further the current amenities, facilities and services, such as sewerage in the village and surrounding area would not support a major increase in the local population

I would also like to draw your attention to the fact the smaller plot identified at the end of Sandy Lane, apart from having even less suitable access then Latimer Drive is also the site of a very extensive and well developed Badger set as well as refuge and habitat for many species I therefore do not feel this is an appropriate site for development due to poor access, flooding problems, lack of facilities and the environmental damage that would be incurred.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>We are concerned about the proposed development 110 Black Street being quite a significant size, doubling the houses down this street. We feel that the infrastructure is insufficient for a development of this size, with poor street lighting and no footpath. We are concerned for our children’s safety having to walk down to the end of the street. We believe the road is 12 foot in width at the narrowest part. How would the street cope with extra cars and traffic? The pumping station continues to flood, as well as the main station in Kessingland, which cannot keep up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JE Phillips

Section Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 362

Comment I'm writing to oppose against the plan to build 70 houses at the back of Latimer Close. The start with Black Street isn't wide enough to take the traffic. The sewer isn't large enough. Black Street is now in a flood plane also I wouldn't have thought you could drive across the footpaths to get to the 2 houses in the sand pit.
John and Terry Payne

Section  
Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID  
906

Comment  
We would like to make the following observations concerning the possible construction of up to 70 new houses on this site.
If this number of new homes were built here it would double the number of existing homes presently in Black Street.
At least a further hundred plus vehicles would then be having to leave and enter Black Street. At the moment most vehicles enter and exit through the Eastern end of Black Street, which at one point is only single track. The other end of Black Street, towards Rushmere, is a single track lane for a mile. Many farm vehicles also use this lane which can cause difficulties when vehicles have to back to find the very few suitable places where vehicles are able to pass each other.
The whole infrastructure of the local area is not designed for large numbers of extra people and vehicles.
Therefore we are opposed to the building of more homes in Black Street and urge you to consider our observations.
Kathleen E Draycott

Section: Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID: 365

Comment: I wish to point out several reasons why it would be wrong to build houses on the land here, between Latymere close, Gisleham. I have lived here for 10 years and experienced the surge, when houses on Black Street were advised of a high risk of flooding, causing panic and worry. The situation would be much worse if, instead of fields, there were roads and houses off Black Street.

The drains and sewers are not adequate as they are and the dam and pumping station between Black Street and the marshes would probably fail. Black Street is a narrow country lane without pavements, the extra traffic from a large building site and the many cars from the new houses when built would lead to many problems for everyone, including the farmers in the area, with massive tractors and trailers.

There is no gas supply to Black Street, the new development would have to rely on bottled gas, oil or electricity.

There is no bus service here, it is a long way from the shops, school and surgery at Kessingland.

The two massive wind turbines opposite Black Street, at the side of the A12 do not enhance the view. They should not have been built there. Will their presence prevent housing along the A12? If not there are "empty" fields near them where Kessingland could expand.

I hope my comments are noted and stored for future reference.
Mr & Mrs Bullen

Section  Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID  373

Comment  Black Street is a small hamlet within a rural setting. My husband and I have lived here for 15 years and we are concerned that it has now been identified for the potential development of 70 houses.

We have significant concerns regarding the potential development and wanted to make sure that our concerns would be taken in to account when the Council considers their planning policy.

Planning applications are considered on their own merits, and therefore the objections I am making to the proposed scheme relate to the development as a whole, and not specifically regarding design, materials, overlooking, as no plans have been submitted.

Black Street is a very narrow road and two cars have difficulty in passing each other. The extra vehicles generated by the proposed development would be at least 35, and this is if there is only one vehicle per household. Realistically most households now own two cars. We already have a problem with oil tankers, and farm vehicles (there are two farms in the vicinity) using this narrow road. It is not only the inconvenience of not being able to pass but also that the surface of the road would certainly deteriorate as a result of the extra vehicular activity generated.

Black Street is in a Flood Zone and heavy rain causes flooding to some of the properties. We are concerned that the current drainage system would not be able to cope with the water produced by the extra households. The marsh land to the back of our house is boggy and also floods.

We believe that the visual impact of such a large development would be harmful to the open and rural character of the area.

The amenities of the residents of Black Street will be adversely affected because of the high density and over development of the site.

There are several badger sets in the area proposed for development and the other wild life, such as deer, bats and birds in the area will be endangered by the proposed development.

Please ensure that our objections are recorded as part of your consultation process, thank you.
Mr & Mrs M Thompson

Section Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 369

Comment We are writing to object to the above planning application. Gisleham is a very small village; this development would double the size of the existing village causing problems with an increase in traffic on a road that is too narrow for two cars to pass. Widening the road is not an option because several houses are built near the road edge. There are no pavements along Black Street making it very dangerous for pedestrians, especially children, and again there is nowhere to put a pavement. The sewers would almost certainly not be able to cope with such a large influx of houses. The extra hard surfaces would also lead to flooding which is already a problem when there is torrential rain. The development proposal is out of character with the rest of the village and therefore not acceptable. We trust that you will strongly consider the points we have raised above, and agree that this proposed development is not appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr &amp; Mrs R Sharp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs Truman

Section Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 368

Comment We do not think that the above potential site is at all suitable for development, in our view, having lived here for 14 years. Gisleham has no services, we all rely on Kessingland for everything. (no shops, buses, doctors, etc.)

As the houses would over double in one go services would very unlikely be unable to cope. Local schools would have to cope with 100+ extra children, some going by car and school bus to Carlton Colville which already has bad parking problems.

Road very unsuitable for children. School bus to Carlton Colville at the end of Black St. All children would have to walk along narrow dangerous road to bus stop and back.

Extra 150 + cars going through narrow village. We already have a problem with tractors, large container lorries any many tankers going up and down our narrow road to Farm quite fast.

Hard sometimes to turn left into Black Street from Snab Hill with amount of cars and larger vehicles coming out of black Street. Entrance to Black Street so narrow you cannot pass so you are continually backing out to let cars out. So what will happen when we get all these extra cars in and out. Plus all these extra houses will have visitors that cannot park in Black Street.

Where do all these cars go?

All cars from new development would have to come out of 1 entrance onto narrow road with no pavements and people (including children) will be walking up and down.

Our sewerage system has a problem to serve the 60 houses here already, there has been problems in the past. How would it suddenly cope with 70 more? Sewerage system has a medium risk of flooding.

Our houses (we live opposite the potential site) would be well below the houses built opposite. At present if we have a deluge of rain the water soaks into the ground. If the ground is concreted over where does the extra water go as we are lower down. Also we are on a medium risk of flooding to the roads edge which would be the edge of a new development. Since we have lived here we have had quite a few flood warnings.

Also we have a bad problems with the turbines we seem to have been left with. There is bad strobing at times form the sun, which goes right across
the potential site and the noise at times can be unbearable. Another complaint to the Council!

Cannot see how this small village with narrow roads, inadequate sewerage system, poor lighting, heavy traffic already with Farm vehicles and no pavement deal with double the quantity of houses.

This quite honestly, in our opinion, would be an overdevelopment in a small village, which would certainly not cope with this large amount of new houses. It would have a really drastic impact in the village.
Mr Trevor & Mrs Julie Wigg

Section  
Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID  
351

Comment  
We wish to make you aware of the strong objections that we have with regards to the potential development above. As a resident of Black Street this scheme will have a serious impact on our village the specific objections are as follows.

Proposed 70 houses will double the size of the village this would cause traffic mayhem with a possibility of 140 cars (plus) in a very rural narrow road as widening the road is not possible. Local children walk to the school bus stop with more houses cars children, walking cycling with no pavements it wouldn't be long for an accident to happen. The plan is on a moderate risk flood plain which slopes down to a high risk flood plan. The village is at the bottom of two hills and the amount of water after a heavy rain that runs down the street is quite considerable flooding has happened in the past.

On numerous occasions the sewerage system has been unable to cope with the village of its present size so more house would increase the problems. The proposed site is ill considered as it crosses a footpath used by villagers to walk, take their dogs and enjoy the countryside.

The corner of the site is an old sand pit which is home to various types of wildlife including badgers this would all be lost.

As there is no bus service or village shop more cars would be used to travel to shops etc in Kessingland and Lowestoft.

We would be grateful if our objections are taken into consideration when deciding this potential application.
A Mower

Section  
Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID  
353

Comment  
I object strongly to the proposal to build houses on land in Black St. Most of Black St is only suitable for single land traffic, there is no room for widening of the road as several of the houses are on the edge of the road, there are no pavements, and no room to add any for the extra people (children going to school). Schooling in the area is already a problem with traffic. The sand pit at the top of Latimer Rd has an active badgers set. The road was never there to cope with the amount of traffic that would be created by the amount of lorries and vehicles where the building are going up, then 70 houses averaging 2 cars per family.
Mr G & Mrs M Woodrow

Section: Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID: 661

Comment:
We are residents of Black Street and have grave concerns regarding the land identified on your plan for potential development of 70 houses. We would like to bring to your attention our concerns so that you will take them into consideration when deciding which land is suitable for potential development.

We summarise our concerns below:
Black Street is a very narrow road and is not wide enough for two cars to pass. It is necessary for one vehicle to pull over (if possible) or to reverse to the closest passing place. As Black Street has no gas supply, it is a regular occurrence for oil tankers to deliver oil to the residents. Obviously if there is insufficient space for two vehicles to pass, when an oil tanker is making a delivery it is impossible to pass. Recently an ambulance was called to the house opposite and no vehicles could pass for the 40 minutes the ambulance was parked outside the property while the paramedics dealt with the medical emergency. The increase of vehicles as a result of such a large development will only make a bad situation worse.
There is no public transport to Black Street.
The land identified for the proposed development is on much higher land than the current houses in Black Street. We are concerned where any excess surface water will go when we have heavy rain. My property has been flooded because of heavy rain.
To the rear of the houses along Black Street is marsh land which floods to such an extent that we have seen windsurfers on the water which covers the fields!
We are concerned that the wildlife will suffer should the development go ahead.
Please record my comments as part of your consultation process.
Mrs T and A Thrower

Section Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 870

Comment We are voicing our concerns against the proposal of seventy houses at the back of Latymer Close / Sandy Lane Gisleham. Flooding has been a big concern, as we became flooded a few years ago. Due to heavy rain bringing water, sand and mud from the back field and into our property.

We feel if houses were built on the proposed plot, water would have nowhere to go, but straight down into our property causing damage. Due to Government, 35% has to be housing association when building new properties, which may result in crime issues.

To add to this, noise levels would go up. Black Street is an extremely narrow road with only very few passing places, and with no way of widening the road.

We feel more houses would create so much more traffic, and pedestrians. As the road is already narrow, there is no way to lay a footpath.

With the amount of vehicles we already have coming into our road, safety is paramount.

We have children walking along the path to catch the bus, residents cycling, walking dogs and some elderly who do not possess a car have no choice, other than to walk down our narrow road.

To add an extra 140 cars (2 approximately per house), would cause catastrophic danger, to all involved.

Gisleham has no gas connection.

Apart from a church and a small village hut, Gisleham does not have the amenities to cater for seventy houses. The local primary school (Carlton Colville, with ongoing road issues at present), and Kessingland our neighbouring village itself, is at full capacity, due to housing development in recent years. To add to this, our local police station which was based at Kessingland has since been turned into residential accommodation.

The proposed plot at the back of our property comprises of a row of over a hundred year old oak trees. The grounds these trees stand on, are habitats to all types of birds, including birds of prey, animals including badgers and many varieties of insects.

To build on this land would have a major devastating impact on conservation.
Section: Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID: 219

Comment: I believe the proposal for 70 dwellings on this site is very inappropriate. There are approximately 55 dwellings in Black St. which have been built intermittently over many years and to suddenly increase this by 70 would profoundly alter the existing community. Black St. is a very narrow road, making it difficult for vehicles to pass each other. This would be exacerbated with the addition of another 100+ cars. There is no footpath along the road and with another 100+ children needing to walk along it to access school buses, plus the additional traffic, the potential for accidents will be greatly increased. Since I have lived in Black St. we have experienced problems with sewage backing up, as it has to be pumped up to Kessingland. Another 70 households would make this problem even worse. These are my main concerns with this proposed site which I think is only suitable for a development of 6-10 dwellings.
Rosemary Moffatt

Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 356

Comment
This proposal is totally unsuitable for Black Street for the following reasons.

1. Black Street is a very narrow, country road which narrows even more towards Henstead and Rushmere. There are several 'pinch points' at the entrance from Snab Hill.

2. It is on the Environmental Agency website as med. to high risk of flooding. This will only increase if Benacre Sluice eventually fails.

3. The pumping station would be unable to cope. It often fails now with resulting sewerage on my patio.

4. Drainage from site would cross Black Street and flood houses.

5. No local services or facilities – Carlton Colville School is already causing enormous traffic problems and more children would only increase the blockages of the roads.

6. Doctors surgery in Kessingland is already struggling to cope – it is difficult enough to get an appointment now.

7. No public transport.

8. Sandy Lane is not an access – it is a footpath and the sand pit has badgers living around it. It is single track only.

The proposal of 70 houses would more than double the number of houses in Black Street. This is a hamlet and this is overdevelopment which will ruin the main reasons the present inhabitants have chosen to live here – peace and quiet.

I strongly oppose this plan.
Comment ID 361

Comment
Reference the proposals of the construction of 70 dwellings in Black Street, Gisleham which is a most unsuitable site.
There are several reasons why this proposal is not practical.
1. Black Street is a country land and is not wide enough for cars to pass each other. It is even more of a problem for lorries and tractors. There is no pavement for pedestrians to walk on.
2. There are no schools in the vicinity.
3. The nearest school is over subscribed.
4. The sewerage system is already under severe pressure without the burden of 70 additional dwellings.
5. There are no shops in the vicinity. On Kessingland High Street there is one general store and one chemist.
6. There is no public transport at all in Black Street The nearest public transport is in Kessingland.
7. The doctors surgery in Kessingland is already stretched.
Additional dwellings would result in over development of a small hamlet. To summarise this must be considered to be a most unsuitable site for development.
Ruth Smith

Section Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID 911

Comment I write to protest against the above proposed development. I am alarmed to hear – not by any notice from your department – but from fellow local residents – that a plan has been submitted to build 70 houses on this greenfield site of productive farmland and marginal land. As you are no doubt aware, Black Street is an ancient winding rural lane, with a small community of mixed age homes. An additional 70 dwellings would more than double the number and is out of all proportion with both the site and the community. Our road is narrow, with no footpath and for much of its length only passable by one vehicle at a time and simply not adequate for potentially 140 more cars, let alone visitors or vans of trades folk. (In my experience modern developers leave not an inch of surplus space for visitors or trades). Situated as we are at a little distance from amenities – schools, dentists, employment, shops, buses, leisure centres – amenities which would struggle locally to accommodate such an increase in population – it is inevitable that these many daily treks would be by car. I would also remind you that the existing homes are right down at sea level. Some houses have suffered flooding both by run-off from the field behind Latymere Close – proposed to be built over, and from bricking up of sewers. Development is likely to worsen this for the existing homes.

It is my understanding that the current land owner of site 110 has also applied to build 970 new houses plus amenities on land at Ellough, only 5.5 miles away. With such a huge number of better served homes to be built so near I question the need to cram so many more into the site at Black Street. We often hear politicians spouting the terrifyingly unsustainable need to build 6 houses a minute to keep up with demand. I would argue that despite years of massive scale development houses only become more and more unaffordable, there is a lack of good secure jobs locally and big development schemes are part of an untenable over blown bubble driven by incomes and landlords. No help to local families first time buying. While there are houses standing empty – one indeed along Black Street – or brown field sites which could be brought into use, green field sites should not be allowed to be destroyed. Because the space for food production, air to breath and wildlife to thrive are as essential for human well being as is housing. More so.
As an aside we don not yet know the result of the EU referendum. If the electorate vote out, net immigration may fall, the economy may dapp and the alleged 'need' to build at such a rate at any cost may prove to be unnecessary. It is also my heart-sinking understanding that in matter of planning there seems to be no right to a view. This is law being an ass perverse state of affairs. When a long established community values and has chosen to live in a place because of its beauty, peacefulness and space, perhaps made sacrifices or paid a premium to be able to live there, then their right to continue to live as they have chosen should be strongly considered. It is easy to dismiss us as Nimby's. But if this was your backyard – if you were to spend a little time here to hear the birdsong, the woodpecker, the tawny owl, have a muntjack or a badger cross your path, watch the bats chasing moths or the barn owl sweep silently by, spot butterflies, bees, dragonflies and the countless beetles and bugs all essential to the ecosystem and agriculture – you would want to protect it too. Indeed you would feel it was your duty. In fact – as controllers of planning and development and public servants it is your duty to protect it, from the ugly, the inappropriate, the obtrusive, the shoddy and downright greedy corruption of both built up and rural environments by developers. Because that is what we get imposed, time after time, field after field. And with this encroachment as a precedent where will end if this field goes? Unless you step in to curtail the outrageous over development I know what we can expect. Yet another soul-less Badger Persimmon dull build, 'accidental' slips of the chainsaw on even the most legally preservation ordered tree, a claustrophobic labyrinth of ticky tacky card board boxes, no sense of architectural vernacular, higgledy piggledy scattered to squeeze in 70 plots so all are overlooked and overlooking all supposedly 'detached' to wring every last pound from each plot but so cramped together and deprived of outside space that there is no light, no privacy, no room to play, kick a ball, grow some veg or a decent tree, have hobbies or friends to visit – the stuff of life. So increasingly obese occupants end up confined to quarters, glued to screens and gadgets for entertainment and getting fatter. Or children wandering feral in the streets beyond to escape. Not right. I do realise that time turns, the population grows, change happens and builders need jobs too so some development must be passed. But in this case an appropriate and proportionate scheme would be more like 12 homes. I can see that to build between Century House and number 12 Latymere Close is infill and it would comfortably take 3 blocks of 4 – mirroring the established 12 properties of Latymere Close which were built well by the local authority and enough space for a rural modest family to park their vehicles, have a tool shed, plant a vegetable patch and dry the washing naturally and not
have for a view next door's backdoor. 12 houses would not overwhelm this small community with traffic or place unabsorbable strain on limited local amenities. The new houses could be set back from the road in a similar line to the Latymere Terraces and in this way would not be so imposing in the space or so obtrusive on the houses opposite on Black Street. The number of houses you permit will determine the price of the land. To allow massive dense development will only drive up land prices and tempt farmers to sell productive land for more horrible housing. Even allowing 12 on the lower part of the site will allow the farmer to get his money and perhaps a smaller scale local builder to make their profit. This would be a responsible plan to pass. I would still be sad the space lost – builders do not tread gently and building work is pretty catastrophic generally. But please let it be a short term disturbance not a permanent catastrophe. (Better still – it would make a beautiful place for a woodland burial ground, especially with the new crematorium between Hulver and Ellough only ten minutes away).

Please consider the view I have expressed and those of my neighbours which I know to be in same vein.
S Lincoln

Section
Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID
377

Comment
I am writing to you to express my opposition to the aforementioned proposed development plan announced by the Waveney District Council that includes the potential built of up to 70 houses in the field behind Latymere Close.

I would be grateful if you could give consideration to the following reasons, which in my opinion expose the seriousness of the grievances and dangers that this development will cause, irreversibly, to the community of Black Street.

1. The development will more than double the size of our side of the whole of Black Street in terms of number of properties, and what is worse will at least triplicate the number of residents and cars using the space along our lane. Black Street lane cannot cope with dual traffic, it is a narrow country lane with very few passing places with most houses and gardens flush with the lane. Large vehicles (tractors, trucks, lorries, vans etc) are often halted by cars transiting or parked on the roadside. This development will cause endless chaos and disruption during the construction phase and for the foreseeable future, due to the sudden increase in the number of vehicles using our lane.

2. This development will put the lives of the current residents at risk on a daily basis. There isn't a pavement, or space for one, so pedestrians will have to continue to share the lane with the passing vehicles. The lane is often used by local people of all ages (from very young children to elderly people) to walk to and from Kessingland. Children often play on or near the lane and ride their bicycles and scooters.

3. The main gardens of all of the Latymere Close properties face the lane. This development and the amount of road traffic it will cause will mean we can no longer trust our children or pets to play in our own gardens without constant vigilance.

4. Every single one of the properties in Latymere Close will be left with no privacy whatsoever. All our main gardens are at the front, facing the lane, which currently does not affect the way we enjoy them as there are very few vehicles going by during the day time hours. However, the traffic will be continuous, noisy and unavoidable along the front of our gardens if this development goes ahead. All our houses also have secluded, smaller
gardens or patios behind our houses. Needless to say these will no longer be secluded or private any more as they will face straight into the development.

5. The development further will accentuate the risk of flooding in Black Street.

6. I know for a fact that our houses currently attract a substantial premium on top of their standard property market value just because of the quiet location and the unspoilt rural aspect of the village. We will clearly lose a lot of money straight away just by this development being approved. The fact that we will no longer have any privacy in any of our gardens or patios will further reduce the value of our houses, and leave them with very few selling points.

7. The field where the plot is proposed is not at all scrubland, as it has been described somewhere in the Council’s report, it is a well-tended, productive crop field surrounded by mature hedges and trees. The views from the back of our houses in Latymere Close, and the front views of all the houses at the other side of the road, are therefore some of the most beautiful prospects of the village. This view will be totally obliterated by the proposed construction. The skyline will be dominated by the new houses, towering over our homes from up the hill.

8. This development will be the end of Black Street as it is. Black Street is a rather unique hamlet in the Gisleham Parish, full of character and heritage. The development will suffocate us, and this will not just be a visual impression. The place will become another suburb: noisy, overcrowded and unattractive.

9. Black Street has the privilege to enjoy a very diverse wildlife, thanks to the abundance of habitats ranging from marshes to meadows and mature trees and thickets. Amongst the animals and birds that we can see around the village there are several key species which deserve protection such as sparrows, cuckoos, thrushes, bats, owls, badgers, deer and hedgehogs. All of this wildlife will doubtlessly suffer, and possibly disappear entirely, should the development go ahead.

10. The developers of the proposed site will have to be very "creative" to sell such high number of houses which will be:

• ostensibly cramped,
• isolated at the end of a very narrow road access,
• overlooking the back of a long row of houses (Latymere Close), which is a rather unattractive view, and
• further overlooking, with nothing to obstruct this view, into two huge wind turbines.

11. One can easily realise that in order to sell, the new properties will have
to be very affordable, thus unintentionally selecting a range of buyers that could further change the way of life in our village, and not for the better.

This development is completely unnecessary and disproportionate

It will irreversibly perturb the life of a hamlet which is rather unique to the Gisleham Parish, which will cease to exist as we know it

It will benefit no one except the landowners selling the field and the developers

It will cause most current homeowners along Black Street lose money as their properties devalue

It may put lives in danger due to the increase in traffic around Black Street

It will cause extensive and permanent damage to the natural habitat and local wildlife, and will accentuate the risk of flooding

Please, give your utmost consideration to our concerns. Thank you.
S Rock

Section: Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID: 877

Comment:
I strongly object to the absurd (potential) housing development on the back of Latymer Close, Gisleham.
I am saddened by the continuous 'carving up' of our beautiful countryside. People need to stop overbreeding and overpopulating! Black Street is in an idyllic small lane. Please let's keep it that way.
There is no gas, no suitable road access and no need to destroy the peaceful lives of the of the hard working residents and pensioners who live here.
Please think about our mature trees, our lush landscapes and views. Protect our wildlife here. Please look after our rural setting and not build concrete houses etc. here, which will blight our neighbourhood.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section  Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID  757

Comment  Based on aerial photographs, site 110 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that this site should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that it may have.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T & J Websdale

Section  Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID  360

Comment  I have been a resident of Black St for twenty years and I am writing to object to the potential land for development in Black St Gisleham. I am greatly concerned that if the proposal goes ahead it will have a significant detrimental effect on the village. The proposal for development should be rejected on the following grounds:
I believe there are 60 houses in our village and 70 houses would double the size of the village and the amount of cars travelling up and down would result in unsafe conditions on the narrow road as there are no pavements and the road couldn't be widened and pedestrians and the school children would be at risk.
The inadequacy of the infrastructure of the water sewerage system would not cope as the road is prone to flooding at present, and the sewerage has flooded in the past.
Part of the proposed site covers an old sand pit which is home to various wildlife including badgers and all this would be lost.
There is no bus service in the village and most definitely no room for buses to travel along the narrow road should a service be introduced.
This proposal needs to be rejected for the safety of our village.
Terence and Margaret Bullard

Section | Potential land for development 110 - Land to the north of Black Street, Gisleham

Comment ID | 918

Comment

It has come to my attention that Waveney District Council have a building proposal on the table for site 110 in Black Street. Whilst I might agree that the land is probably suitable for a small number of houses, it is impossible to contemplate up to 70 houses being on the site. There are several reasons for this that I list below.

1. There are only 65 houses in Black Street so the number of houses proposed would more than double the hamlet’s population.
2. This situation would put extreme pressure on the sewage system which already has problems coping.
3. There are no local shops.
4. No public transport.
5. No pavements.
6. Narrow roads where it in most cases cars cannot pass one another.
7. The proposed houses would be higher than the existing road and rain would flow down and flood the lane and probably houses.
8. The lower part of Black Street is already on the environment department’s list for medium risk of flooding so any excess would be disastrous.
9. The schools in the area are already over-subscribed.
10. The loss of mature oak trees.
11. No regular policing in the area including Kessingland our nearest village.
12. The local doctor’s surgery is finding it difficult to cope with the number of patients now.

At the average of two cars per household it would cause absolute chaos on Black Street’s narrow lanes and could put lives at risk. Also any housing on that site would be affected, as we all are, by the wind turbines. The strobing through the winter months, and the horrendous noise whenever the wind blows.

In conclusion I would like to state that I hope Waveney District Council will conclude that such a proposal would only have a negative effect on the residents of Black Street, and will likely cause extreme problems.
### Potential land for development 111 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road, Lowestoft

**Andrew Hughes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 111 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road, Lowestoft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This development would impinge visually on the Suffolk Wildlife land and the marshland beyond. Traffic from it would add further pressure to Beccles Road and traffic travelling North from the development would naturally go via the Oulton Broad crossing rather than the new third crossing which would add to the traffic problems in Oulton Broad. It would also add pressure to existing heath and education services which are already stretched.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous

Section | Potential land for development 111 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road, Lowestoft

Comment ID | 991

Comment | I wish to draw your attention to the fact that Waveney District Council, in its new Local Plan for the District, have indicated that land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road in South Oulton Broad is potentially earmarked for development. These areas - marked 111, 112 and 7 on their interactive map - are hard up against the boundary of the Broads National Park and Carlton Marshes and as a result seem wholly unsuitable for building. The areas are currently green fields which form a barrier between the housing to the south of the Beccles Road and the marshes and broad. Any development here would be visible from the Broads National Park from the Carlton Marshes right along to Nicholas Everitt Park in Oulton Broad itself. Properties on the north side of Oulton Broad would also see the housing along with boat users, walkers and other broad users. Many species of wildlife would be disturbed and misplaced should any development take place, and we have regularly seen barn owls hunting in the areas outlined. We feel the Carlton Marshes and Southern Broads would be severely compromised with housing hard up against the park boundary and another wilderness area would be lost forever. Surely there are enough brownfield sites in Lowestoft to develop? The scale of the planned housing is also frightening; 37 houses on plot 111 which will go nowhere to solving any shortage - and a staggering 760 in area 7, which will create a village on top of the marshes. As family members of Suffolk Wildlife Trust, we have contacted them with the proposals of which they are aware and are currently preparing a response. We would implore you to investigate this matter urgently as well and if you require any further information from us please do not hesitate to contact us.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Natalie Beal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

Section | Potential land for development 111 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road, Lowestoft

Comment ID | 1231

Comment | The Areas 7 and 112 and 111 west of Beccles Road should be kept clear of additional development in order to preserve the wild life of the marshes.
Potential land for development 111 - Land to the north of the A146
Beccles Road, Lowestoft

This area is completely unsuitable for new housing as the surrounding road system and main access road - the A146 - is already running at more than capacity, which is clear from the regular tailbacks which stretch from Oulton Broad right back to Hollow Grove Way. The site also backs on to the Broads National Park and Carlton Marshes, managed by the Suffolk Wildlife Trust, and they are very unlikely to allow development to take place right up to their boundary. The area is also home to many species of wildlife - including nesting barn owls - which would clearly be disturbed.
Surely it makes sense to look at developing brownfield sites and there are plenty of ex-industrial areas in the Lowestoft area which should be considered and used before contemplating using greenfield areas?
I also note there are very few areas around Southwold and Reydon marked as suitable for development?
Martin Fiddes

Section Potential land for development 111 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road, Lowestoft

Comment ID 498

Comment Further to my previous comment; any development here would be visible from the Broads National Park from the Carlton Marshes right along to Nicholas Everitt Park in Oulton Broad itself. Properties on the north side of Oulton Broad would also see the housing along with boat users, walkers and other broad users. Many species of wildlife would be disturbed and misplaced should any development take place.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
<td>Potential land for development 111 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road, Lowestoft</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>I do not think this will be a good site for housing. It open countryside with views and access to the river valley. Visually and aesthetically destructible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S Lineham

Section Potential land for development 111 - Land to the north of the A146
Beccles Road, Lowestoft

Comment ID 434

Comment This land is not suitable for development. It provides an open vista towards
Oulton Broad, which is important for the local landscape. It is used by gulls,
barn owls, deer and foxes and provides a buffer between houses and the
nature reserve and Broads National Park.

Beccles Road is already overwhelmed by traffic and is often queued up to
the Crown roundabout in the direction of Oulton Broad. Traffic is also heavy
in the other direction and queues during peak times around the Barnby
bends. The A146 cannot absorb this extra traffic in either direction, and
there is not enough employment in Lowestoft and local areas so people will
need to travel for work. There is not the capacity in local health services or
schools either.

The increased number of people in the immediate vicinity will be highly
likely have an adverse impact on nearby Carlton Marshes nature reserve
which includes an SSSI. Already there are problems with dogs off leads and
fouling, and also antisocial behaviour which is likely to increase with higher
volumes of people.

Drainage water could cause pollution in the marshes further down the hill
and adversely affect septic tank drainage of properties including the
education centre for the wildlife trust,
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section  
Potential land for development 111 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road, Lowestoft

Comment ID  
718

Comment  
Sites 7; 11 and 112 are adjacent to parts of the Broadland Special Protection Area (SPA); The Broads Special Area of Conservation (SAC); the Broadland Ramsar site and Sprat’s Water & Marshes, Carlton Coleville Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), these sites are of national and international nature conservation value and a large part of them is owned and managed by Suffolk Wildlife Trust as part of our Carlton and Oulton Marshes reserve. Development in this location appears likely to risk an adverse impact on these sites. The sites may also have ecological value in their own right. For these reasons we would object to their allocation for development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

**Section**  
Potential land for development 112 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road (2), Lowestoft

**Comment ID**  
861

**Comment**  
Sites 7 /112 /111 – These lie along the Broads boundary albeit separated by the railway line. Potential for impacts on Landscape character (LCA6) and visual amenity. This would extend the urban boundary of Lowestoft towards the Broads area. Certainly there are likely to be additional recreational pressures as a result of housing development in the area. The Suffolk wildlife Trust and the Carlton marshes reserve lie in close proximity. Housing development at this locating could also create additional land use pressures on fields and grazing marsh in close proximity as residents may seek land for other activities such as allotments, horse grazing etc.
### Carlton Colville Town Council Alison Ayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 112 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road (2), Lowestoft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The Areas 7 and 112 and 111 west of Beccles Road should be kept clear of additional development in order to preserve the wild life of the marshes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Martin Fiddes

Section | Potential land for development 112 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road (2), Lowestoft

Comment ID | 235

Comment | Completely unsuitable, the low number of houses (101) coupled with the 37 indicated for the neighbouring area marked 111 (37 houses) will go nowhere to solving the shortage but will put an unfeasibly large number of cars onto an already congested road. Can you imagine trying to turn right onto the Beccles Road in rush hour?!
Matthew Gooch

Section  Potential land for development 112 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road (2), Lowestoft

Comment ID  283

Comment  The development of a large number of housing here will put extreme pressure on Carlton Marshes Nature Reserve and the SSSI designations on it which at present suffer from a wildlife disturbance and site misuse point of view.

A further few hundred houses here will mean an increase in dogs walkers using the site and people that the very sensitive condition of the the habitats that are classed as some of the best of their type in the uk will not sustain without major detriment to an area of much enjoyment for the 70,000 people already living in the town. And instead of putting pressure on the nature reserves doorstep we should consider protecting this area for many years to come for the use and pleasure of the people already living in the local area and beyond.

Pressure will increase on wildlife from disturbance an issue that nature conservation struggles with now and the risk here of increased poor quality water ending up in the dykes of high nature conservation for there excellent water quality is also high from increased surface covering, the current internal drainage board system can only just cope with the quantities of water that arrive there from small amounts of rainfall in the catchment which heightens the flood risk of the sensitive sites.
Norman Castleton

Section  
Potential land for development 112 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road (2), Lowestoft

Comment ID  
272

Comment  
i do not think that development in this area is a very idea. Like (1) it would despoil an area of landscape with views up/and to the river valley. It would destroy the character and natural habitat of the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S Lineham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | This land is not suitable for development. It provides an open vista towards Oulton Broad, which is important for the local landscape. It is used by gulls, barn owls, deer and foxes and provides a buffer between houses and the nature reserve and Broads Nation Park.

Beccles Road is already overwhelmed by traffic and is often queued up to the Crown roundabout in the direction of Oulton Broad, Traffic is also heavy in the other direction and queues during peak times around the Barnby bends. The A146 cannot absorb this extra traffic in either direction, and there is not enough employment in Lowestoft and local area so people will need to travel for work. There is not the capacity in local health services or schools either.

The increased number of people in the immediate vicinity will be highly likely have an adverse impact on nearby Carlton Marshes nature reserve which includes an SSSI. Already there are problems with dogs off leads and fouling, and also antisocial behaviour which is likely to increase with higher volumes of people.

Drainage water could cause pollution in the marshes further down the hill and adversely affect septic tank drainage of properties including the education centre for the wildlife trust,
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 112 - Land to the north of the A146 Beccles Road (2), Lowestoft

Comment ID 719

Comment Sites 7; 11 and 112 are adjacent to parts of the Broadland Special Protection Area (SPA); The Broads Special Area of Conservation (SAC); the Broadland Ramsar site and Sprat’s Water & Marshes, Carlton Coleville Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), these sites are of national and international nature conservation value and a large part of them is owned and managed by Suffolk Wildlife Trust as part of our Carlton and Oulton Marshes reserve. Development in this location appears likely to risk an adverse impact on these sites. The sites may also have ecological value in their own right. For these reasons we would object to their allocation for development.
Potential land for development 113 - Land to the north west of 1-4 Wangford Road, Uggeshall

Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  Potential land for development 113 - Land to the north west of 1-4 Wangford Road, Uggeshall

Comment ID  1064

Comment  Proximity to Church of St Mary, grade I as well as several grade II listed buildings including Church Farmhouse, Uggeshall House, Churchyard walling, Whitehouse Farm and barn. Potential impact upon setting of high grade listed building and other listed buildings.
John Lavery

Section  Potential land for development 113 - Land to the north west of 1-4 Wangford Road, Uggeshall

Comment ID  145

Comment  This comment also applies to plot 15 adjacent to 113. To put a new housing development here would be nothing short of criminal. Apart from being almost entirely agricultural land this is a tranquil rural area with some very low density housing. A development of this type would completely alter the character of Uggeshall, which doesn't have or want the infrastructure required to support this sort of scheme. It could only become a dormitory area completely at odds with its surroundings. There simply must be better places to put housing than this.
### Potential land for development 114 - Land to the south of Church Lane, Corton

**Gill Armstrong**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 114 - Land to the south of Church Lane, Corton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This land is within the hundred year erosion area, as stated in the SMP, which at present is still designated as managed retreat. Access onto the Coast Road would be difficult as it is a busy, narrow country lane. Utilities are stretched in Corton, water pressure is already low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 114 - Land to the south of Church Lane, Corton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Church of St Bartholomew grade II * to north. Potential impact on high grade Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 114 - Land to the south of Church Lane, Corton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Approve of this site, it fits well into the building envelop of the existing village and does not protrude extensively into the strategic gap as of the other options available around Corton. There is also an existing road system in place to service any future development. It would also address the issue of &quot;roll back&quot; for existing properties East of the &quot;red line&quot; and coastal erosion. Close proximity to existing schools, shops and bus routes and aesthetically keeps the heart of the village community close unlike Hopton and Blundeston.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M J Edwards & Partners Chris Edwards
Strutt & Parker LLP (Fiona Harte)

Section
Potential land for development 114 - Land to the south of Church Lane, Corton

Comment ID
1128

Comment
I write in relation to Waveney District Council’s consultation on the new Waveney Local Plan exercise and on behalf of our client Christopher Edwards of M J Edwards & Partners. I am pleased to put forward the following site: land of Church Lane, Corton, Suffolk to be considered as a residential allocation in Waveney District Council’s new Local Plan. Having discussed the matter with the planning policy team, I have been advised that submissions up to 30th June, 2016 will be accepted and considered. Our client welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Waveney Local Plan, which will be a single document containing all the planning policies and proposed development sites in the District.

The Site
Our client’s site is located to the north of Corton, which is classified in the Waveney Core Strategy (The Approach to Future Development in Waveney to 2021) as a 'large village'. The Core Strategy states that 'a small amount of new housing, employment and services and facilities development will be focused on a number of designated larger villages. Up to 5% of the housing growth will be focused in these villages. Where a local housing need is demonstrated, the priority will be for affordable housing. Most development will take place on brownfield sites within the villages but some development may be needed on greenfield sites on the edge.'

Although in March 2015, Waveney district stated that it was able to demonstrate that it had a 5.9 years supply of housing land from 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2021, the statement recognises that the district has experienced under-delivery in terms of the targets set out in the Core Strategy. This is because in the current year 2015/2016 it is anticipated that 162 dwellings will be completed as opposed to the annual target of 290. Therefore the site at Church Lane could contribute to meeting Waveney’s housing needs.

The village of Corton has a good range of shops, services and facilities including a shop, primary school and a number of pubs and restaurants. Corton also has good public transport links and acts effectively as a suburb of Lowestoft, which itself has a population of over 70,000. A regular bus service (1 and 1A) connects the village to the larger town of Lowestoft in...
just under 15 minutes; it also provides direct links to Gorleston and Great Yarmouth. Lowestoft has a much larger range of facilities including a range of high street stores, several doctors' surgeries, several primary schools, a high school and a railway station, with regular services to Norwich and Ipswich.

The site itself is located to the north of the village, on Church Lane. The site adjoins the settlement boundary and therefore development on the site would represent a logical extension of Corton. Suitable access could be achieved off Church Lane, however the speed limit is currently national speed limit and therefore it is proposed that the 30mph (48km/h) zone be extended northwards to increase the safety of the access. The site is in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at low risk of flooding.

The site is well-related to the settlement of Corton and has existing residential development running along its southern boundary. The site is well contained to the east by Church Lane, which provides a clear boundary to the site, beyond which there are some houses and a caravan park. There are also allotments beyond the site boundary on the western side of Church Lane, and it is proposed that these could be extended westwards slightly if additional plots are required to sever the proposed new community.

The western boundary is screened by a tree belt, which follows the route of the dismantled Yarmouth to Lowestoft railway line. This tree belt helps to contain the site and provides a natural boundary on its western side. It is proposed that the northern boundary of the site would be created by providing a screening buffer of trees and hedgerows, which would help to screen the site from the north, while providing biodiversity benefits for wildlife – this would be carefully integrated with the existing pond and enhancements made.

The site is capable of accommodating circa 120 dwellings (density of 30 dwellings per hectare) and new public open space and/or an extension to the adjacent allotments with approximately 40 affordable dwellings (35% dependent on viability assessment). The exact dwelling type and tenure mix would be agreed with the Waveney District Council's housing department.

In light of the above it is clear that the site is a sustainable location with good access to shops, services and facilities. The site is available and could contribute to meeting the district's housing targets within the next 5 years. Therefore it is recommended that the site should be allocated for residential development in the new Waveney Local Plan to help meet Waveney's housing requirements over the course of the plan period.
Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Alan Bagust

Section Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID 407

Comment The scale of a development is overwhelming. It would contradict the Landscape Character Assessment. The local services cannot support such numbers. Schools, Health, road infrastructure and Emergency services. Halesworth is already isolated from health services. If development in any number is required then it should be distributed across the town and within its existing housing boundaries.
Alan Baguste

Section  Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  408

Comment  Site 115. The scale of a development is overwhelming. It would contradict the Landscape Character Assessment. And is also outside the "physical limits" rule. The local services cannot support such numbers. Schools, Health, road infrastructure and Emergency services. Halesworth is already isolated from health services. If development in any number is required then it should be distributed across the town and within its existing housing boundaries.
Amy Daniels

Section  
Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  
70

Comment  
I thoroughly disagree with the proposed housing on the field behind Dukes Drive. Nearly 1000 homes with an average of 2 people a home will put an enormous strain on our Doctors, schools, transport and employment. We only have one primary school which is full with very little room for expansion. The traffic during school time is already very busy. This will increase transportation within the town to various village schools. The Doctors surgery is already over worked and obtaining an appointment can be up to a two or three weeks wait.

A Lot of our facilities in Halesworth have been closed and are about to closed due to lack of funds. Walpole road would not cope with the increase in traffic if each house had a vehicle.

The wildlife would seriously be affected as this is an area of natural habitat. What facilities would the developer provide for the town should the proposed development go ahead? What sort of housing is to be built? Will there be affordable housing for the young people to buy. Will there be social housing?

Our small Market Town does not have the Retail Facilities for another 2000 + people I believe the fields behind Dukes Drive are Green Belt! I feel if we lose them we lose are beautiful countryside.

This is for plot 115 and 116
Andrew Barnes

Section  
Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  
677

Comment  
We cannot possibly imagine the impact of up to 1000 houses being built on Sites 115 and 116. It would completely change the character of this end of Halesworth, from a very pleasant country town into a nightmare scenario of hundreds more cars and people. Parking cars in town is difficult enough now (bring back the 1 hour free parking in the centre car park!). It would be impossible with all those extra cars.

We have lived here for many years and hope to continue to do so for a long time yet. It is a lovely place to live, with friendly neighbours, many of whom have also lived here for many years. Many of us have this lovely view across the fields, this being what attracted us to our bungalow initially and we would certainly not wish to lose this asset! I cannot imagine looking out on to bricks and mortar in place of the lovely green fields and trees. You also raise the point that local facilities will be overwhelmed, which would mean that further building drainage etc enlargement of doctors facilities etc would all have to take place.

I am certainly against this idea of this proposal.
Beverley Arthrell

Section  
Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  
117

Comment  
I MOST STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL
THIS IS FARMLAND, NOT A BUILDING PLOT.
NOISE AND TRAFFIC GENERATED WITH CONSTRUCTION IS NOT ACCEPTABLE
SCHOOLS AND HEALTH SERVICES IN HALESWORTH ARE ALREADY
OVERLOADED.
HALESWORTH MUST NOT BE TURNED INTO A SPRAWLING METROPOLIS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Holden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment    | Sirs, I MOST STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposal of development of this farmland.  
The town of Halesworth is a small market town is not appropriate for this size of development  
The infrastructure such as schools and medical facilities are already overloaded.  
The extra traffic and noise produced which would be generated for myself and neighbours is not acceptable.  
Regards, William Holden |
Bill Jackson

Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID 503

Comment
We, as local residents object to the proposed allocation of this sites 115/116 ("the Sites") within the emerging Waverley Local Plan ("the Local Plan"). The proposed allocation is for 420 houses and 560 houses on the sites. This would be a far greater density of residential premises than exists in the areas of Halesworth adjoining the site. This would lead to a disproportionate spread of people throughout the town, with greater densities of residential premises further away from the centre of the town, rather than in the centre. Before considering the expansion of the town's boundaries adequate consideration needs to be given to increasing the density of sites in Halesworth currently underused for residential accommodation.

The proposed allocation of these sites would allow for the expansion of the town far beyond its traditional boundaries and would encroach on greenfield, agricultural land. There is a need for agricultural land and the agricultural sector is currently under a great deal of strain. It would be inappropriate to allocate these sites for residential accommodation without first exhausting the options for infill and/or brownfield development within the town.

There are sites currently listed for consideration in the town which should be considered in advance of this site, as they are preferable sites for satisfying the council's housing need, once objectively assessed (i.e. 161, 155, 65, etc.). These sites are within the boundaries of the town, are not in areas of countryside or agriculture, are (in many instances) brownfield land which has been previously developed. These sites should be considered in preference to 115/116 as they would not expand the boundaries of the town, would not encroach upon the countryside, would not deprive the vicinity of agricultural land, and would not constitute development on previously undeveloped, greenfield land.

Furthermore and in general, Halesworth does not have the public services to support an increase in population size. The local middle school and hospital were both recently cut and the town is currently underserviced. The allocation of these sites, for this number of houses, would be inappropriate as the town does not have the infrastructure to support
them.
Brenda Ling

Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID 114

Comment

We are absolutely against any such development on these sites. We have been to the public exhibition in town today a 2% growth is more than enough!
* Existing facilities cannot take any more people or cars.
* Primary school fit to bursting, more traffic to ferry children to High Schools
* Surgery cannot get appointments now, no Drs wanting to become GPs. No matter if a new facility was built, and where?
* Arable (farm land) needs to be preserved as we rely on imports to much now and as the world is today, we could soon be cut off from suppliers and need to grow more food. Look into future and see if we keep building then our island will be just concrete.
* More houses just encourages more immigrants to come and abuse our system.
* Look at laws concerning second homes and buy to let, this could free up so many houses in Suffolk, that stand empty most of the year!
* There are no jobs, no shops, no facilities.
* Keep Halesworth a small market town not a sprawling unrecognisable hamlet.
* Water and drainage systems, overflow now in wet weather conditions.
* More retired people, more strain on medical asylums. Furthest away from any major hospital, our hospital to close down.
Brian Frost

Section  
Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  
166

Comment  
1. Problem with schools - The local middle school has been closed fairly recently which leaves only a first school in the area (the older pupils are bussed to Bungay). So with a large increase of houses, a brand new school system would have to be implemented to cope with the numbers of "new" children to the area. Why close a middle school if a development was envisaged and where would that be built? The present first school could not cope.

2. Lay of the land - The area under consideration does have quite a "hollow" in the middle so it collects a lot of water. If you look on the fields between Halesworth and Walpole in the wet weather you would see that a lot of the fields do become waterlogged. With a large development close by there doesn’t seem to be any room for the excess water to be accommodated and the problem of flooding would be a big concern.

3. Infrastructure - The medical centre would not be large enough to cater for the large number of people who might need medical advice. So that would have to be dealt with too - though I think there are plans afoot to do some enlarging of the present medical centre.

If there is need to put housing in this area, other sites come to mind but observations on 2 and 3 would still apply. Examples would be the area between Saxon Way and the industrial estate on the Bramfield Road, the presently disused site where the middle school was recently demolished and close to the middle of the town.
Chapman

Section Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID 645

Comment This site together with site 116 is for a total of over 900 houses. That is probably over 3000 extra on the population of our small market town, how can this increase be allowed? The NHS services in the town are already struggling to cope, the Surgery cannot take any more patients without further extension and somehow extra doctors will also be needed. The local school system has already been broken up with the closure of the Middle School which has necessitated the two primary schools to be expanded to full capacity, there is no room for any more children. The concreting over of these two fields will force all rainwater straight down to the river which already floods with heavy rainfall so the lower end of that plot will be prone to flooding on a regular basis. These two sites together with the others earmarked will change our town forever, it should not happen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David Winter
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section
Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID
772

Comment
The "Initial sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" paper is encouraging in that the only negative points identified relate to;
(A) "conserving and enhancing the quality and distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes"
(B) "reducing contributions to climate change and mitigate effects"
(C) "conserving natural resources"
In response to item (A), whilst this is certainly a matter for consideration, we believe this potential issue can be addressed by the implementation of strategic landscaping in association with any future development, as well as the inclusion of attractive open space. With regard to items (B) and (C), considering Site 115 is Greenfield land, it is often the case that potential issues can be identified in relation to these matters, however given the potential scale of the development at the site, and it’s proximity to Site 116 (which we have also been submitted on behalf of our client) we believe that a potential development could be designed to involve particular features and infrastructure improvements to mitigate and counteract these potential issues.
The site extends to approximately 14.40 hectares and could accommodate up to approximately 432 dwellings (based on an assumed 30 dwellings per hectare). The site is within the sole ownership of our client and is considered suitable, available and deliverable in the next 1-5 years. Development of the site would represent a logical extension to the town along Walpole Road. It is abutted by residential development to the east, and the southern boundary is formed of a public highway. As mentioned previously within this representation, the land to the south is also owned by our client, and further details regarding that site are set out overleaf. When considering potential employment growth opportunities within Waveney and it’s surrounding districts, it is important to realise that Halesworth is situated only approximately 14.8 miles to the north west of Sizewell, an area where there is likely to be considerable employment growth over the coming decade. Consequently, we believe that the site’s vicinity to this employment growth area helps to improve it’s sustainability. Whilst we appreciate that it may not be preferable for the entirety of the
site to be developed, we will continue to focus on the site as a whole as we believe it possesses the capabilities required to potentially facilitate considerable residential development, in that it benefits from excellent access and is serviceable.

Subsequent to the above narrative, we consider the site to represent a sustainable opportunity for development and we look forward to continued engagement with the emerging Local Plan process in relation to this site.
### DC Patrick Newsagents DC Patrick

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes please when is Halesworth going to restart growing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diane Thomas

Section Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID 204

Comment

I understand that a further application for the development of site 115 has again been submitted via the landowner and possible property developer. The exception it seems is for 420 instead of 430 properties. However I note that site 116 is for a further 560 houses making a grand total of 980!

In September 2007 I submitted my comments to the WDC and Halesworth Town Council on the then Site 168 and to this effect enclose a copy of my notes together with those now referred to as Sites 115 and 116.

My original comments remain but since then there have been additional pressures on the town.

Health and social care

The present population is already putting extreme pressures on doctors and clinical facilities not least of which is the planned closure of Patrick Stead Hospital. To increase the population by probably at least 1,500 people raises critical questioning of this application. Day and residential care are limited and out of town placements make contact and support difficult and oft times inappropriate.

Education

Since the last application Halesworth Middle School has closed requiring the transport of children to Beccles and Bungay. How would this affect the education of young people from the new estates for surely the dwellings should not be for all retired people?

Car parking

The Angel car park is presently under review as a hub for public transport thus reducing parking facilities. Where would the increase of daily shoppers park as walking distances would be in excess?

Transport

Public transport varies. The hourly rail service between Lowestoft and Ipswich is good but bus services vary. A volunteer service is a wonderful help but could not be stretched to include the proposed developments.

Employment

Continues to be limited and would again demand an increase in road traffic and parking for commuters.

Retail facilities

These continue to be limited and would again demand more car users and
car parking facilities. The proposed sites are too far removed for people to generally walk/shop.

Facilities for waste
Still very limited. No proposal for local facilities thus an increase in possible ‘fly tipping’.

Site development
The present local road systems are totally unsuitable for such developments and not least would be a real concern for drainage.

Halesworth is a small rural market town. Thanks to the efforts of volunteers some facilities have improved not least for youngsters in the town part and the Millennium Green. However Sites 115 and 116 are quite inappropriate and would serve to benefit the landowner and possible developer. Sites 115 and 116 are not conductive to ‘affordable housing’ and perhaps an alternative consideration could be given to owners of second/holiday homes so that they could become more available to young families. Thus for all the above reasons and the effect on surrounding wildlife and the community I totally oppose the applications for the proposed development of Sites 115 and 116 and view these applications as totally unsuitable for such a small market town.

ENCLOSURE
RE: PLANNING POLICY, WA VENEY DISTRICT COUNCIL - SITE NO.168
I previously attended a local meeting and exhibition which included plans for the future of Halesworth and I now find further proposals under consideration for the area, amongst which is Site No. 168. This is a site which appears to be in direct conflict with the nature, needs and development of the area therefore I totally oppose this development for the following reasons:

To construct a development of 430 houses would be over and beyond what the infrastructure could cope with or need. 430 houses would mean at least approximately 1,000 people of all ages thus affecting the utility services, health, education, traffic, transport, social care, shops, businesses, employment and social facilities e.g. community centre/library. 430 houses based on todays average= 800+ cars (2 per family). 1,000 people would have need for medical care - present surgery is already over stretched and the hospital facilities are constantly under threat. Dental care is limited with many people already having to go beyond Halesworth for treatment.

Care of the elderly/infirm already under pressure. Limited affordable sheltered housing/care homes/day care available. Help/support via Social Services restricted due to limited finance and/or availability of trained staff. Education establishments are running to near capacity and pre school
facilities are limited. Parking by schools, both pre and after school hours, is creating problems now for other road users. 

Car parking already a nightmare so where would the additional car parks be bearing in mind the inclusion of other proposed developments? Retail facilities are adequate at present, although limited. Where would other retail outlets be placed. Don't forget, not everybody has transport to go out of town! We still lack a community centre or centre for the young people, for this respect Halesworth appears to be the Cinderella of Waveney District Council and Suffolk County Council. There has already been much debate and arguments, and ultimately no decision reached on this matter which does not bode well for the future of the town. Employment is limited with professional people in particular and many others already having to travel out of Halesworth which would, in turn with this development, increase vehicles on the road resulting in extra wear and tear on the roads. Where would people work because surely WDC would not wish to see an increase in the retired population? Thanks to the effect over recent years by groups and individuals in the area an improvement has been made to the present transport system but demands are already increasing. WDC has been slow to acknowledge the problem especially the elected members who generally seem to have little use or understanding of the need for transport. We are being encouraged to be 'green' but for the present community the nearest waste sites are in Beccles and Southwold. This is quite unrealistic and the constant requests for a 'tip' have been unsuccessful. I would suggest that with a site such as no.168 and other in the region, the problems would increase and just encourage fly tipping. Although accepting a need for more domestic properties and the Government policy for such developments, Halesworth is a small market town only just holding onto to its identity. It does not portrait the potential for becoming a large and impersonal area. Such a development as Site No.168 would totally destroy the town and would serve to benefit the landowners and developers only. It would appear that they have no real concern for the social aspects on the infrastructure of the area but rather see this as an opportunity for monetary gain! Equally, perhaps the Government/Local Councils might to give consideration to the way local properties have been bought as second/holiday homes for financial gain as seen regularly in this area. This situation has helped increase the price of property thus depriving young and local people the opportunity to remain in the area. Thus for all the above reasons together with the effect on surrounding
property and wildlife, I totally oppose the application for the proposed development of Site No.168.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section  Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  530

Comment  This land is not suitable for development for the following reasons:-
* It is productive agricultural land.
* It is outside the present town limit.
* There are opportunities to provide the residential allocation for the Plan period significantly closer to the town centre than this land.
* The land is remote from the town centre and residential development of the scale suggested would overwhelm the road network and the infrastructure of the town.
* The crest of this large field is a prominent feature on the approach to Halesworth from the west and residential development here would conspicuously harm the landscape setting of the town.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section  
Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  
1203

Comment  
The sites further north 106,140,141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town. There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section  Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  836

Comment  Sites 115 and 116 are beyond the 'natural' end of the town at Dukes Drive. The Walpole Road cannot support a development of 980 extra houses. The infrastructure as in schools, doctors and access to medical care is completely inadequate for any such development. This would be very unpopular with HTC and the residents of Halesworth.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  1066

Comment  Cookley White House, grade II to south and the Grange grade II to south east. Potential impact on setting of listed buildings.
Julian Munson

Section  Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  539

Comment  Housing development on this site (115) would be inappropriate and unsustainable for the following reasons;
This site (115) indicates 420 new homes which equates to an additional 966 people (based on the national average of 2.3 people per household) which would be totally unsuitable for a town that has limited services (particularly social, leisure and education) and the main retail and employment activity and health services are over a mile away and not within easy walking distance. This population increase is significantly higher than any of the Options listed for the Waveney Local Plan.
If site 115 was allocated for housing, it would be highly likely that the neighbouring site 116 would also be approved for housing allocation. Therefore the two sites 115 and 116 collectively would add an estimated 2254 additional people to the town representing a percentage increase of nearly 48%. This would be highly unsustainable and is not in line with the indicated Options for the Waveney Local Plan which suggests housing growth in Halesworth of 5% for Options 1, 2 and 4 and 8% for Option 3.
The pressure on infrastructure and services would be completely unsustainable as Halesworth currently faces the following issues;
* No further education provision i.e. nearest high school is 9 miles away in Bungay
* A vocational training centre with an uncertain future (North Suffolk Skills Academy due to close)
* No dedicated sports centre
* No swimming pool (nearest at Bungay 9 miles away)
* Limited community hall facility (Rifle Hall is the only community hall in the town but limited on space, capacity and services)
* Only one small supermarket
* Limited range of services within the town compared to larger market towns and urban centres
* Limited health provision with major hospitals some distance away at Gorleston and Norwich
* Limited growth in local employment opportunities
Site 115 in particular is also affected by the following issues;
* Not within easy walking distance of key services and facilities;
* 1.5+ miles from any primary school
* 1.5+ miles from health services e.g. doctors surgery
* 1.5+ miles from the proposed Halesworth Campus site (future services)
* Over 1 mile from the retail centre of the town
* 2.0 miles to the main industrial estates on Norwich Road (The Blyth Road Industrial estate offers a lower number of employment options)
* Almost 1.5 miles to the Halesworth train station and main bus stops
* Currently on open farmland (which is being farmed) and therefore should be retained for agricultural use to help meet future demands for cereal and other crops (for food and energy demands as population continues to increase)
* Has no existing infrastructure and services in place e.g. water, sewerage, electricity, telecoms/broadband as well as no road infrastructure.
* Likely to generate significant traffic movements due to the distance from services and employment and thus residents much less likely to walk and instead use personal transport. This is in conflict with current policies which encourage less reliance on using private vehicles and more sustainable, healthy communities based on walking and exercise.
* Halesworth has an aging population (with average age significantly higher than the national average) and therefore greater impact on aged care and health services. This needs to be taken into consideration.
* Services (health, social, leisure), employment options and transport hubs in Halesworth are largely all in the northern part of the town (north of Quay St/Holton Rd), therefore it would be sensible to ensure that any future housing sites allocated are within close proximity or within walking distance (within 1 mile). More sensible and sustainable options could be proposed sites 65, 151 and 152 as examples.
Janet Rice

Section Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID 868

Comment With reference to the proposed housing development behind Dukes Drive (site 115) and also Bedingfield Crescent (site 116) I wish to make the following points:

980 new houses will need to comply with the government’s intention to create affordable homes for first time buyers and consequently a sizeable proportion will be young families. This will have a considerable effect on the demographics of this small town and implications to its infrastructure. If we assume that 60% - or 600 houses, have two children, education, health and social needs must be met. Pre-school and primary education cannot accommodate the proportion of these that are most likely to be under 10 years of age and expansion of the facilities is not possible given that the school borders the main road and a housing estate. The middle school could have accommodated an increase but alas, has just been demolished and resources disposed of. The skills centre is totally unsuitable as the rooms are too small, or designed as workshops.

There will of course be children 11-18 category and the two local high schools are currently close to capacity; Sir John Leman is full. Places are available in schools in the Lowestoft area but it seems foolish to deliberately build houses in an area that necessitates transporting that number of children to schools elsewhere.

This age group has additional issues that will require addressing; bored teenagers result in anti-social behaviour. One outdoor swimming pool and skate park will not suffice; facilities must be created to help deal with this problem before it arises.

Healthcare is also a major concern. The current health centre is already stretched to deal with the requirements of the town, appointments frequently are extremely difficult to obtain. With nearly 1000 houses, 2000 adults (many potentially pregnant) and approximately 1500 children, services will not cope.

Dukes Drive already has a tendency to flood as the drainage system cannot cope with the existing houses, this will only get worse with an additional 1000 homes and the subsequent loss of absorbent ground. The impact of building on site 116 will mean the flooding that does now occur in this farm land will be transferred downstream to the town.
Finally, the shops, roads and basic facilities will need improving if the town is to survive even a small increase in houses. Employment opportunities for this demographic is also sadly lacking in this area. Although this sounds as 'not in my back yard', it genuinely isn't. The demographics of this area may improve with some new homes but the number proposed cannot be absorbed by the community. Other sites that can provide proximity to schools, & health facilities are available elsewhere that would benefit from a rebalance with the population and would be a more suitable option as they might regenerate less well managed areas and improve them. I hope the Council consider these points before making a decision.
Joanna Barfield

Section  
Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  
146

Comment  
Very concerned about this. It's alongside a biodiversity site / area of beauty. Prone to flooding down in the valley. Makes Halesworth sprawl outwards into the countryside. Better to keep housing within the town pocket / up on higher ground near industrial site on way to Norwich near major road.
John Ling

Section Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID 925

Comment I believe this site to be most unsuitable because:
1. This end of Waveney area would only be sold to older people leaving London who would not work here putting more strain on local services.
2. Roads here are not suitable for extra traffic.
3. There is already 3 week waiting lists for doctors.
4. It is prime agricultural land.
5. Sewers at capacity already.
6. Huge water main runs through both plots.
7. Schools already overflowing.
Louise & Heath Sewell & Caplin

Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID 155

Comment My following comments relate directly to site no's 115 & 116. I totally oppose this development for the following reasons: This large volume of proposed houses would be beyond the capabilities of the existing infrastructure. This quantity of housing would mean at least approximately 1,000 people moving into the area. Existing services are already over stretched these include education, health, transport, traffic, social care, shops, employment and social facilities. We have no large supermarkets in the area and this doesn't look like changing anytime soon. Surgery and dental care are already stretched to the limits, to the point we already have to pay for private dental care. We have one school left in the area now Halesworth Middle has closed. Education establishments are already running to full capacity and it is difficult to understand how such a vast uplift in population will be integrated into the existing education system. Parking for only school left is already chaotic and creates problems for other road users. We lack a community centre, sports centre and other leisure facilities. Employment is limited, certainly for professional people. Many people are already travelling out of Halesworth for employment. The existing road structure is nowhere near adequate for what would be a massive increase in traffic. Drainage is also a problem and we understand there is a potential of flooding on this land. Accidents have occurred on Walpole Road, one of which was a fatality. Halesworth is a small market town only with Halesworth only just holding on to its identity such a development on these sites could potentially kill the town and serve only to benefit the land owners and developers. For the above reasons together with the potential negative effect on surrounding properties and wildlife I totally oppose the proposed development of site no's 115 & 116.
Lynn Tricker

Section Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID 80

Comment Having lived adjacent to this site for 12 years, I have noticed the increase in incidents of flooding of the River Blyth. Building on this area and also site 116 will have an increased impact on this ever increasing problem.

is this site really intended for affordable housing? If so its not ideally located for any amenities within easy walking distance for families who are the prime candidates for such housing. This would mean more unnecessary traffic. If it is not intended for affordable housing, then do we really need more second home owners in the town as they bring little or no benefit to the community or economy. Whoever the occupants are,mt hey will put further pressure on the already stretched medical amenities in the town.

i am also concerned about the consequences to the vast array of wildlife I have seen on this land since living here...barn owls, marsh harriers, deer, hedgehogs, foxes, hares plus all the songbirds. This over development will have a huge impact on our natural environment and soon we will have no countryside left!

i was born in rural Suffolk...we want it kept rural, not a concrete jungle!!
**Mr & Mrs B Hammond**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Do we need? And can we accommodate 980 more houses in Halesworth. The sewage treatment plant must be near capacity. We have a small primary school, the doctors surgery is already overworked. There are no work opportunities. Presumably the extra surface water would be channelled to the flood plain endangering existing properties. This proposal would devalue properties by ruining an attractive area and a greenfield site. Not suitable or acceptable. If expansion is necessary it would be better to the north of the town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nic Pike

Section  Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  68

Comment  Objection to this proposed development on the following grounds:
* Unacceptable high density and over development of site
* Detrimental affect on residential amenity of neighbouring properties
* visual impact of area
* negative visual impact on Halesworth and Walpole
* Development is out of scale to Halesworth town (combined with proposal 116 this will increase the town population by approximately 40% assuming average 4 person occupancy)
* Loss of existing views from properties and loss of vista from Walpole towards Halesworth
* Halesworth infra-structure will be unable to cope with this over development - lack of schools, doctors, dentists, transport links, employment prospects.
Bernard Everett

Section  Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  148

Comment  In 2010 it was deemed this site was unsuitable. Six years on nothing has changed so it is still unsuitable. This would spoil the rural view and wildlife like birds, foxes, hedgehogs and insect life would suffer. Also take thousands of pounds off the properties over looking this view there are brown sites available for development. This amount of house on site 115 and 116 nearly 1,000 that's 2,000 people plus. Our doctors, schools, sewage water drainage could not cope. Pollution would increase, due to increase of traffic. You need to consider this any time you want to see the view behind my house you would be welcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul Cope</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peter Cockerton and Karen Evans

Section  Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID  915

Comment  We do not think that land west of Halesworth on either side of Walpole Road is suitable for a large development. # 115, 116
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section
Potential land for development 115 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 1), Halesworth

Comment ID 802

Comment Site 115 & 116 are outside the village envelope, which should end at Dukes Drive. The existing infrastructure could not support the 980 proposed housing to the north of the town.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tony Langford</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Alan Baguste

Section  Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID  409

Comment  Site 116:
The scale of a development is overwhelming. It would contradict the Landscape Character Assessment. And is also outside the "physical limits" rule.
The local services cannot support such numbers. Schools, Health, road infrastructure and Emergency services. Halesworth is already isolated from health services. If development in any number is required then it should be distributed across the town and within its existing housing boundaries.
Amy Daniels

Section Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID 93

Comment I thoroughly disagree with the proposed housing on the field behind Dukes Drive. Nearly 1000 homes with an average of 2 people a home will put an enormous strain on our Doctors, schools, transport and employment. We only have one primary school which is full with very little room for expansion. The traffic during school time is already very busy. This will increase transportation within the town to various village schools. The Doctors surgery is already over worked and obtaining an appointment can be up to a two or three weeks wait. A Lot of our facilities in Halesworth have been closed and are about to closed due to lack of funds. Walpole road would not cope with the increase in traffic if each house had a vehicle. The wildlife would seriously be affected as this is an area of natural habitat. What facilities would the developer provide for the town should the proposed development go ahead? What sort of housing is to be built? Will there be affordable housing for the young people to buy. Will there be social housing? Our small Market Town does not have the Retail Facilities for another 2000 + people I believe the fields behind Dukes Drive are Green Belt! I feel if we lose them we lose are beautiful countryside. This is for plot 115 and 116
Andrew Barnes

Section  
Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID  
678

Comment  
We cannot possibly imagine the impact of up to 1000 houses being built on Sites 115 and 116. It would completely change the character of this end of Halesworth, from a very pleasant country town into a nightmare scenario of hundreds more cars and people. Parking cars in town is difficult enough now (bring back the 1 hour free parking in the centre car park!). It would be impossible with all those extra cars.

We have lived here for many years and hope to continue to do so for a long time yet. It is a lovely place to live, with friendly neighbours, many of whom have also lived here for many years. Many of us have this lovely view across the fields, this being what attracted us to our bungalow initially and we would certainly not wish to lose this asset! I cannot imagine looking out on to bricks and mortar in place of the lovely green fields and trees. You also raise the point that local facilities will be overwhelmed, which would mean that further building drainage etc enlargement of doctors facilities etc would all have to take place.

I am certainly against this idea of this proposal.
B A Munson

Section
Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID
403

Comment
Housing development on this site would be totally unsuitable for the following reasons;
A development of 560 homes (as indicated) could create an increase in population of over 1200 people which for a town with a population of around 4,700 people would be unsustainable and result in significant pressure on existing services and infrastructure (listed in more detail below). Development at this location would be totally unsuitable for a town that has limited services (particularly social, leisure, health and education) and those existing services e.g. Doctors surgery and primary school, as well as the main retail and employment areas are 1-2 miles away and not within easy walking distance.

day points to consider:
- Health services e.g. Doctors surgery is already under significant pressure.
Halesworth has a particularly high proportion of elderly people and with the proposed closure of the Patrick Stead hospital and Southwold hospital already closed there is no local provision and people need to be transported to Gorleston or Norwich. Future care for the elderly should be a particular consideration
- Education - Halesworth has no provision for secondary or further education with the nearest high school 9 miles away. A significant population increase in the town would therefore not be appropriate
- Retail and Services - Halesworth is a small market town with limited retail/service provision and only one small supermarket. The nearest major retail centres are Lowestoft and Norwich and road access is via smaller B roads. There is not enough provision to sustain a large population increase and would put pressure on local roads with people driving to other larger centres
- Employment - Halesworth has a limited provision of employment and so any increase in population would need to be supported by an increase in jobs provision otherwise people will commute out to other areas and therefore unsustainable
- Community facilitates - Halesworth does not have a dedicated community hall which meets the needs of the town with the current population let alone any with future increase (the current Rifle Hall is small and unsuitable
for many uses).
- Transport - this site is some distance from the main public transport hub at Halesworth train station and people would be unlikely to walk and therefore there could be a significant increase in traffic as a result of people driving.

Environmental - this site is located next to an attractive river valley and there is not only threat to existing wildlife and nature including kingfishers and newts but also potential risk of flooding impact in the future. Therefore a large housing development would not be appropriate. There would also be loss of agricultural land which is currently actively farmed.

If the neighbouring site 115 was also allocated for housing there could be an additional 420 new homes and potentially almost an extra 1000 people. The town would not be able to cope with this massive increase in population as there is not enough employment and provision of services – particularly health and education.
Beverley Arthrell

Section  Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID  119

Comment  I MOST STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL
THIS AREA IS DESIGNATED AS FARMLAND, NOT A BUILDING PLOT
EXTRA TRAFFIC AND NOISE GENERATED BY CONSTRUCTION AND THE USE
OF WALPOLE ROAD BY THESE RESIDENCES AFTER CONSTRUCTION IS NOT
ACCEPTABLE.
SCHOOLS AND HEALTH SERVICES IN HALESWORTH ARE ALREADY
OVERLOADED
THE TOWN OF HALESWORTH IS UNIQUE AND MUST NOT BE TURNED INTO
ANOTHER SPRAWLING METROPOLIS
Bill Holden

Section  Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID  113

Comment  Sirs,
I MOST STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF THIS FARMLAND.
The additional traffic and noise generated by this development is not acceptable to myself or neighbours.
The infrastructure of schools and health services are already overloaded.
The town of Halesworth is unique and must not be turned into another sprawling metropolis.
Bill Jackson

Section
Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID
502

Comment
We, as local residents object to the proposed allocation of this sites 115/116 ("the Sites") within the emerging Waverley Local Plan ("the Local Plan").

The proposed allocation is for 420 houses and 560 houses on the sites. This would be a far greater density of residential premises than exists in the areas of Halesworth adjoining the site. This would lead to a disproportionate spread of people throughout the town, with greater densities of residential premises further away from the centre of the town, rather than in the centre. Before considering the expansion of the town's boundaries adequate consideration needs to be given to increasing the density of sites in Halesworth currently underused for residential accommodation.

The proposed allocation of these sites would allow for the expansion of the town far beyond its traditional boundaries and would encroach on greenfield, agricultural land. There is a need for agricultural land and the agricultural sector is currently under a great deal of strain. It would be inappropriate to allocate these sites for residential accommodation without first exhausting the options for infill and/or brownfield development within the town.

There are sites currently listed for consideration in the town which should be considered in advance of this site, as they are preferable sites for satisfying the council's housing need, once objectively assessed (i.e. 161, 155, 65, etc.). These sites are within the boundaries of the town, are not in areas of countryside or agriculture, are (in many instances) brownfield land which has been previously developed. These sites should be considered in preference to 115/116 as they would not expand the boundaries of the town, would not encroach upon the countryside, would not deprive the vicinity of agricultural land, and would not constitute development on previously undeveloped, greenfield land.

Furthermore and in general, Halesworth does not have the public services to support an increase in population size. The local middle school and hospital were both recently cut and the town is currently underserviced. The allocation of these sites, for this number of houses, would be inappropriate as the town does not have the infrastructure to support
them.
Brenda Ling

Section | Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID | 115

Comment | We are absolutely against any such development on these sites. We have been to the public exhibition in town today a 2% growth is more than enough!

* Existing facilities cannot take any more people or cars.
* Primary school fit to bursting, more traffic to ferry children to High Schools
  * Surgery cannot get appointments now, no Drs wanting to become GPs. No matter if a new facility was built, and where?
* Arable (farm land) needs to be preserved as we rely on imports to much now and as the world is today, we could soon be cut off from supplies and need to grow more food. Look into future and see if we keep building then our island will be just concrete.
* More houses just encourages more immigrants to come and abuse our system.
* Look at laws concerning second homes and buy to let, this could free up so many houses in Suffolk, that stand empty most of the year!
* There are no jobs, no shops, no facilities.
* Keep Halesworth a small market town not a sprawling unrecognisable hamlet.
* Water and drainage systems, overflow now in wet weather conditions.
* More retired people, more strain on medical asylums. Furthest away from any major hospital, our hospital to close down.
Brian Frost

Section
Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID
167

Comment
1. Problem with schools - The local middle school has been closed fairly recently which leaves only a first school in the area (the older pupils are bussed to Bungay). So with a large increase of houses, a brand new school system would have to be implemented to cope with the numbers of "new" children to the area. Why close a middle school if a development was envisaged and where would that be built? The present first school could not cope.

2. Lay of the land - The area under consideration does have quite a "hollow" in the middle so it collects a lot of water. If you look on the fields between Halesworth and Walpole in the wet weather you would see that a lot of the fields do become waterlogged. With a large development close by there doesn’t seem to be any room for the excess water to be accommodated and the problem of flooding would be a big concern.

3. Infrastructure - The medical centre would not be large enough to cater for the large number of people who might need medical advice. So that would have to be dealt with too - though I think there are plans afoot to do some enlarging of the present medical centre.

If there is need to put housing in this area, other sites come to mind but observations on 2 and 3 would still apply. Examples would be the area between Saxon Way and the industrial estate on the Bramfield Road, the presently disused site where the middle school was recently demolished and close to the middle of the town.
David Hassam

Section  
Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID  
461

Comment  
SITE 116 (BEHIND BEDINGFIELD CRESCENT AND KENNEDY AVENUE) and SITE 115 (BEHIND DUKES DRIVE)

These particular sites are on the edge of town on greenfield sites. These are highly inappropriate sites for new housing as they could be regarded as rural sites on the outer edge of town and on existing, actively farmed, land. Housing development on these sites would be unsustainable as they are located at least a mile from the major town centre services of Halesworth and up to 2 miles to the primary school. People will be far less likely to walk over distances such as this and are much more likely to drive, creating significantly higher traffic movements and air pollution. This conflicts with environmental policies.

Although Halesworth serves a wide rural area, future significant housing growth would not be sustainable with the current level of service provision. For example, major hospitals at Gorleston or Norwich are both 45 mins away. The current doctors surgery is also not within walking distance of these proposed sites 115 and 116, and the future of the local Patrick Stead hospital is uncertain.

Education provision is also limited with no high school or middle school, children will therefore have to be bussed to neighbouring towns resulting in much higher traffic movements and a less environmentally sustainable education model.

Future housing development in Halesworth should be concentrated on existing brownfield sites within walking distance of town centre services, education and healthcare facilities.
With regard to the "Initial sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" paper, the same potential issues have been identified in relation to Site 115 that have been for Site 116. Consequently, our response to these matters for Site 116, at this stage, mirror those we have set out at point 1.11 within this representation document.

The site extends to approximately 18.48 hectares and could accommodate up to approximately 554 dwellings (based on an assumed 30 dwelling per hectare). We appreciate that, given the scale of this site, it may not be preferable for the entirety of the site to be developed. However we consider that the continued availability of the entirety of the site is important in relation any future development to the west of Halesworth more generally, and also because the whole site possesses the required capabilities in order to facilitate considerable residential development, in that it benefits from excellent access and would be relatively easily serviceable.

Development of the site would represent a logical extension to the town along Walpole Road. It is abutted by residential development to the east, and the northern boundary is formed of a public highway. We appreciate that the southern most area of the site is potentially subject to some flood risk, however we would like to confirm that we would not necessarily expect this subject area to be developed out, and perhaps instead that it could be incorporated into a wider development as open space or a community facility of a similar purpose. It should be noted that this area that is potentially prone to flooding comprises only a small part of the overall site.

The site is within the sole ownership of our client and it is considered suitable, available and deliverable in the next 1-5 years.

Subsequent to the above narrative, we consider Site 116 to represent a sustainable opportunity for development and we look forward to continued engagement with the emerging Local Plan process in relation to this site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Yes please when is Halesworth going to restart growing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diane Thomas

**Section**
Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

**Comment ID**
205

**Comment**
I understand that a further application for the development of site 115 has again been submitted via the landowner and possible property developer. The exception it seems is for 420 instead of 430 properties. However I note that site 116 is for a further 560 houses making a grand total of 980!

In September 2007 I submitted my comments to the WDC and Halesworth Town Council on the then Site 168 and to this effect enclose a copy of my notes together with those now referred to as Sites 115 and 116.

My original comments remain but since then there have been additional pressures on the town.

**Health and social care**
The present population is already putting extreme pressures on doctors and clinical facilities not least of which is the planned closure of Patrick Stead Hospital. To increase the population by probably at least 1,500 people raises critical questioning of this application. Day and residential care are limited and out of town placements make contact and support difficult and oft times inappropriate.

**Education**
Since the last application Halesworth Middle School has closed requiring the transport of children to Beccles and Bungay. How would this affect the education of young people from the new estates for surely the dwellings should not be for all retired people?

**Car parking**
The Angel car park is presently under review as a hub for public transport thus reducing parking facilities. Where would the increase of daily shoppers park as walking distances would be in excess?

**Transport**
Public transport varies. The hourly rail service between Lowestoft and Ipswich is good but bus services vary. A volunteer service is a wonderful help but could not be stretched to include the proposed developments.

**Employment**
Continues to be limited and would again demand an increase in road traffic and parking for commuters.

**Retail facilities**
These continue to be limited and would again demand more car users and
car parking facilities. The proposed sites are too far removed for people to generally walk/shop.

Facilities for waste
Still very limited. No proposal for local facilities thus an increase in possible 'fly tipping'.

Site development
The present local road systems are totally unsuitable for such developments and not least would be a real concern for drainage.

Halesworth is a small rural market town. Thanks to the efforts of volunteers some facilities have improved not least for youngsters in the town part and the Millennium Green. However Sites 115 and 116 are quite inappropriate and would serve to benefit the landowner and possible developer. Sites 115 and 116 are not conductive to 'affordable housing' and perhaps an alternative consideration could be given to owners of second/holiday homes so that they could become more available to young families.

Thus for all the above reasons and the effect on surrounding wildlife and the community I totally oppose the applications for the proposed development of Sites 115 and 116 and view these applications as totally unsuitable for such a small market town.

ENCLOSURE
RE: PLANNING POLICY, WA VENNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL - SITE NO.168
I previously attended a local meeting and exhibition which included plans for the future of Halesworth and I now find further proposals under consideration for the area, amongst which is Site No. 168. This is a site which appears to be in direct conflict with the nature, needs and development of the area therefore I totally oppose this development for the following reasons:

To construct a development of 430 houses would be over and beyond what the infrastructure could cope with or need. 430 houses would mean at least approximately 1,000 people of all ages thus affecting the utility services, health, education, traffic, transport, social care, shops, businesses, employment and social facilities e.g. community centre/library.

430 houses based on todays average= 800+ cars (2 per family). 1,000 people would have need for medical care - present surgery is already over stretched and the hospital facilities are constantly under threat. Dental care is limited with many people already having to go beyond Halesworth for treatment.

Care of the elderly/infirm already under pressure. Limited affordable sheltered housing/care homes/day care available. Help/support via Social Services restricted due to limited finance and/or availability of trained staff.

Education establishments are running to near capacity and pre school
facilities are limited. Parking by schools, both pre and after school hours, is creating problems now for other road users.

Car parking already a nightmare so where would the additional car parks be bearing in mind the inclusion of other proposed developments?

Retail facilities are adequate at present, although limited. Where would other retail outlets be placed. Don't forget, not everybody has transport to go out of town!

We still lack a community centre or centre for the young people, for this respect Halesworth appears to be the Cinderella of Waveney District Council and Suffolk County Council. There has already been much debate and arguments, and ultimately no decision reached on this matter which does not bode well for the future of the town.

Employment is limited with professional people in particular and many others already having to travel out of Halesworth which would, in turn with this development, increase vehicles on the road resulting in extra wear and tear on the roads. Where would people work because surely WDC would not wish to see an increase in the retired population?

Thanks to the effect over recent years by groups and individuals in the area an improvement has been made to the present transport system but demands are already increasing. WDC has been slow to acknowledge the problem especially the elected members who generally seem to have little use or understanding of the need for transport.

We are being encouraged to be 'green' but for the present community the nearest waste sites are in Beccles and Southwold. This is quite unrealistic and the constant requests for a 'tip' have been unsuccessful. I would suggest that with a site such as no.168 and other in the region, the problems would increase and just encourage fly tipping.

Although accepting a need for more domestic properties and the Government policy for such developments, Halesworth is a small market town only just holding onto to its identity. It does not portray the potential for becoming a large and impersonal area. Such a development as Site No.168 would totally destroy the town and would serve to benefit the landowners and developers only. It would appear that they have no real concern for the social aspects on the infrastructure of the area but rather see this as an opportunity for monetary gain!

Equally, perhaps the Government/Local Councils might care to give consideration to the way local properties have been bought as second/holiday homes for financial gain as seen regularly in this area. This situation has helped increase the price of property thus depriving young and local people the opportunity to remain in the area.

Thus for all the above reasons together with the effect on surrounding
property and wildlife, I totally oppose the application for the proposed
development of Site No.168.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section: Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID: 529

Comment: This land is not suitable for development for the following reasons:-
* It is productive agricultural land.
* It is outside the present town limit.
* There are opportunities to provide the residential allocation for the Plan period significantly closer to the town centre than this land.
* The land is remote from the town centre and residential development of the scale suggested would overwhelm the road network and infrastructure of the town.
* This large field is a significant feature on the approach to Halesworth from the west as it slopes down to the river Blythe - residential development here would conspicuously harm the landscape setting of the town and the Blythe valley.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID 1204

Comment The sites further north 106,140,141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town. There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**        | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints: Source Protection Zone 2  
*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).  
Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section
Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID
837

Comment
Sites 115 and 116 are beyond the 'natural' end of the town at Dukes Drive. The Walpole Road cannot support a development of 980 extra houses. The infrastructure as in schools, doctors and access to medical care is completely inadequate for any such development. This would be very unpopular with HTC and the residents of Halesworth.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section | Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID | 1067

Comment | Cookley White House, grade II to south west and the Grange grade II to south east. Potential impact on setting of listed buildings.
Julián Munson

Section: Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID: 536

Comment: Housing development on this site (116) would be inappropriate and unsustainable for the following reasons:
A development of 560 homes (as indicated) would result in a population increase of 1288 people (based on a national average of 2.3 people per household). Based on the 2011 Census when the Halesworth population was 4,726, development on this site would see an overall increase in the town’s population of 27% which would be totally unsuitable for a town that has limited services (particularly social, leisure and education) and the main retail and employment activity and health services are over a mile away and not within easy walking distance. This population increase is significantly higher than any of the Options listed for the Waveney Local Plan.
If site 116 was allocated for housing, it would be highly likely that the neighbouring site 115 would also be approved for housing allocation. This site (115) indicates 420 new homes which equates to an additional 966 people. Therefore the two sites 115 and 116 collectively would add an estimated 2254 additional people to the town representing a percentage increase of nearly 48%. This would be highly unsustainable and is not in line with the indicated Options for the Waveney Local Plan which suggests housing growth in Halesworth of 5% for Options 1, 2 and 4 and 8% for Option 3.
The pressure on infrastructure and services would be completely unsustainable as Halesworth currently faces the following issues;
* No further education provision i.e. nearest high school is 9 miles away in Bungay
* A vocational training centre with an uncertain future (North Suffolk Skills Academy due to close)
* No dedicated sports centre
* No swimming pool (nearest at Bungay 9 miles away)
* Limited community hall facility (Rifle Hall is the only community hall in the town but limited on space, capacity and services)
* Only one small supermarket
* Limited range of services within the town compared to larger market towns and urban centres
* Limited health provision with major hospitals some distance away at...
Gorleston and Norwich
* Limited growth in local employment opportunities
Site 116 in particular is also affected by the following issues;
* Not within easy walking distance of key services and facilities;
* 1.5+ miles from any primary school
* 1.5+ miles from health services e.g. doctors surgery
* 1.5+ miles from the proposed Halesworth Campus site (future services)
* Over 1 mile from the retail centre of the town
* 2.0 miles to the main industrial estates on Norwich Road (The Blyth Road Industrial estate offers a lower number of employment options)
* Almost 1.5 miles to the Halesworth train station and main bus stops
* Currently on open farmland (which is being farmed) and therefore should be retained for agricultural use to help meet future demands for cereal and other crops (for food and energy demands as population continues to increase)
* Currently adjacent to an attractive river valley openly viewed from the current main Walpole road. Housing development on this site would not only be unsightly but may also have a detrimental effect on existing nature and birdlife such as kingfishers - a loss for future generations.
* There is uncertainty over future potential flood impact due to the close proximity to the river valley. In the longer term there could be a flood risk to some homes.
* Has no existing infrastructure and services in place e.g. water, sewerage, electricity, telecoms/broadband as well as no road infrastructure.
* Likely to generate significant traffic movements due to the distance from services and employment and thus residents much less likely to walk and instead use personal transport. This is in conflict with current policies which encourage less reliance on using private vehicles and more sustainable, healthy communities based on walking and exercise.
* Halesworth has an aging population (with average age significantly higher than the national average) and therefore greater impact on aged care and health services. This needs to be taken into consideration.
* Services (health, social, leisure), employment options and transport hubs in Halesworth are largely all in the northern part of the town (north of Quay St/Holton Rd), therefore it would be sensible to ensure that any future housing sites allocated are within close proximity or within walking distance (within 1 mile). More sensible and sustainable options could be proposed sites 65, 151 and 152 as examples.
Janet Rice

Section Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID 869

Comment With reference to the proposed housing development behind Dukes Drive(site 115) and also Bedingfield Crescent (site 116) I wish to make the following points:

980 new houses will need to comply with the government's intention to create affordable homes for first time buyers and consequently a sizeable proportion will be young families. This will have a considerable effect on the demographics of this small town and implications to its infrastructure. If we assume that 60% - or 600 houses, have two children, education, health and social needs must be met. Pre-school and primary education cannot accommodate the proportion of these that are most likely to be under 10 years of age and expansion of the facilities is not possible given that the school borders the main road and a housing estate. The middle school could have accommodated an increase but alas, has just been demolished and resources disposed of. The skills centre is totally unsuitable as the rooms are too small, or designed as workshops.

There will of course be children 11-18 category and the two local high schools are currently close to capacity; Sir John Leman is full. Places are available in schools in the Lowestoft area but it seems foolish to deliberately build houses in an area that necessitates transporting that number of children to schools elsewhere.

This age group has additional issues that will require addressing; bored teenagers result in anti-social behaviour. One outdoor swimming pool and skate park will not suffice; facilities must be created to help deal with this problem before it arises.

Healthcare is also a major concern. The current health centre is already stretched to deal with the requirements of the town, appointments frequently are extremely difficult to obtain. With nearly 1000 houses, 2000 adults (many potentially pregnant) and approximately 1500 children , services will not cope.

Dukes Drive already has a tendency to flood as the drainage system cannot cope with the existing houses, this will only get worse with an additional 1000 homes and the subsequent loss of absorbent ground. The impact of building on site 116 will mean the flooding that does now occur in this farm land will be transferred downstream to the town.
Finally, the shops, roads and basic facilities will need improving if the town is to survive even a small increase in houses. Employment opportunities for this demographic is also sadly lacking in this area. Although this sounds as 'not in my back yard', it genuinely isn't. The demographics of this area may improve with some new homes but the number proposed cannot be absorbed by the community. Other sites that can provide proximity to schools, & health facilities are available elsewhere that would benefit from a rebalance with the population and would be a more suitable option as they might regenerate less well managed areas and improve them. I hope the Council consider these points before making a decision.
Joanna Barfield

Section: Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID: 147

Comment: Very concerned about this. It's alongside a biodiversity site / area of beauty. Prone to flooding down in the valley. Makes Halesworth sprawl outwards into the countryside. Better to keep housing within the town pocket / up on higher ground near industrial site on way to Norwich near major road.
John Lavery

Section | Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID | 136

Comment | This Comment refers to Blocks 115 and 116. The gap between Halesworth and Walpole doesn't need any further reduction by encroachment of Halesworth on good agricultural land. Better to infill between Halesworth and the Airfield or Holton rather than any more development on this side of Halesworth
John Ling

Section Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID 926

Comment I believe this site to be most unsuitable because:
1. This end of Waveney area would only be sold to older people leaving London who would not work here putting more strain on local services.
2. Roads here are not suitable for extra traffic.
3. There is already 3 week waiting lists for doctors.
4. It is prime agricultural land.
5. Sewers at capacity already.
6. Huge water main runs through both plots.
7. Schools already overflowing.
Louise & Heath Sewell & Caplin

Section
Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID
156

Comment
My following comments relate directly to site no's 115 & 116. I totally oppose this development for the following reasons: This large volume of proposed houses would be beyond the capabilities of the existing infrastructure. This quantity of housing would mean at least approximately 1,000 people moving into the area. Existing services are already over stretched these include education, health, transport, traffic, social care, shops, employment and social facilities. We have no large supermarkets in the area and this doesn’t look like changing anytime soon. Surgery and dental care are already stretched to the limits, to the point we already have to pay for private dental care. We have one school left in the area now Halesworth Middle has closed. Education establishments are already running to full capacity and it is difficult to understand how such a vast uplift in population will be integrated into the existing education system. Parking for only school left is already chaotic and creates problems for other road users. We lack a community centre, sports centre and other leisure facilities. Employment is limited, certainly for professional people. Many people are already travelling out of Halesworth for employment. The existing road structure is nowhere near adequate for what would be a massive increase in traffic. Drainage is also a problem and we understand there is a potential of flooding on this land. Accidents have occurred on Walpole Road, one of which was a fatality. Halesworth is a small market town only with Halesworth only just holding on to its identity such a development on these sites could potentially kill the town and serve only to benefit the land owners and developers. For the above reasons together with the potential negative effect on surrounding properties and wildlife I totally oppose the proposed development of site no's 115 & 116.
Lynn Tricker

Section: Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID: 81

Comment: Having lived adjacent to this site for 12 years, I have noticed the increase in incidents of flooding of the River Blyth. Building on this area and also site 115 will have an increased impact on this ever increasing problem.

Is this site really intended for affordable housing? If so its not ideally located for any amenities within easy walking distance for families who are the prime candidates for such housing. This would mean more unnecessary traffic. If it is not intended for affordable housing, then do we really need more second home owners in the town as they bring little or no benefit to the community or economy. Whoever the occupants are, they will put further pressure on the already stretched medical amenities in the town.

I am also concerned about the consequences to the vast array of wildlife I have seen on this land since living here...barn owls, marsh harriers, deer, hedgehogs, foxes, hares plus all the songbirds. This over development will have a huge impact on our natural environment and soon we will have no countryside left!

I was born in rural Suffolk...we want it kept rural, not a concrete jungle!!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr &amp; Mrs B Hammond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nic Pike

Section  Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID  69

Comment  Objection to this proposed development on the following grounds:
* Unacceptable high density and over development of site
* Detrimental affect on residential amenity of neighbouring properties
* visual impact of area
* negative visual impact on Halesworth and Walpole
* Development is out of scale to Halesworth town (combined with proposal 115 this will increase the town population by approximately 40% assuming average 4 person occupancy)
* Loss of existing views from properties and loss of vista from Walpole towards Halesworth
* Halesworth infra-structure will be unable to cope with this over development - lack of schools, doctors, dentists, transport links, employment prospects.
Paul Cope

Section: Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

Comment ID: 150

Comment: Would increase the spread of Halesworth towards Walpole and build on green landscape.
### Peter Cockerton and Karen Evans

**Section**  
Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth

**Comment ID**  
916

**Comment**  
We do not think that land west of Halesworth on either side of Walpole Road is suitable for a large development. # 115, 116
### Section

**Potential land for development 116 - Land to the west of Halesworth (Block 2), Halesworth**

### Comment ID

803

### Comment

Site 115 & 116 are outside the village envelope, which should end at Dukes Drive. The existing infrastructure could not support the 980 proposed housing to the north of the town.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tony Langford</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Andrew Pitt

Section Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID 609

Comment I do not think it is in the best interest of the local community to build beyond the existing settlement boundary of Reydon. There are many reasons for not building on particular sites; environment and economic. The main reason, however, is that surrounding Reydon with housing with developments which will inevitable become holiday home ghettos is not in the best interest of permanent residents or the region in general if it is to continue to attract tourists.

I think most residents would support the building of new homes on in-fill/brown field sites within the village, as long as there is a method of ensuring the houses are for permanent occupation - not investment opportunities as holiday homes. It is the responsibility of local councils to ensure any future development is for local people who intend to live and work here, and not supply houses which, in the long term, change the balance of the population so that Reydon becomes, like Southwold, little more than a holiday village.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Key Questions Q5 Are there any areas of land you think are suitable or not suitable for development? Reydon - Rissemere Land and Easton Bavents are unsuitable - also the field across from Keens Lane. Could perhaps add some houses near Pitches View.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AR Hall & Sons
Savills (Philip Rankin)

**Section**

Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

**Comment ID**

771

**Comment**

With regard to the "Initial sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" paper, the same potential issues have been identified in relation to Site 117 that have been for Site 118. Consequently, our response to these matters for Site 117, at this stage, mirror those we have set out at point 1.17 within this representation document.

The site extends to approximately 19.80 hectares and could accommodate up to approximately 600 dwellings (based on an assumed 30 dwelling per hectare). We appreciate that, given the scale of this site, it is unlikely that it would be suitable or appropriate for the entirety of the site to be developed. However we consider that the continued availability of the site is important in relation any future development at site 118, in order to provide the option to involve some of the land to help facilitate a suitable wider development strategy to the north of Halesworth Road.

The site is within the sole ownership of our client and it is considered suitable, available and deliverable in the next 1-5 years.

Subsequent to the above narrative, we consider Site 117 to represent a sustainable opportunity for development and we look forward to continued engagement with the emerging Local Plan process in relation to this site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charlotte Sanderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section  | Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID  | 277

Comment  | This comment applies to site 117 118 and 138. I understand there has to be growth. But the school s and others do not reflect this there will be no places in the school Southwold as a town cannot cope with anymore holiday makers and second homeowners. the road system esp the Halesworth Road cannot cope. The traffic gets banked up right past st felix school trying to get into an already unable to cope town in the summer. I cant see a safe way that access for these is going to be found. No highschools what jobs will there be. Also no supermarket s. Will be too far out of town for most so will have to drive into southwold.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:  
Source Protection Zone 1  
*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).  
G D Humphries

Section: Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID: 887

Comment:
As I have lived in Reydon for a great number of years I have seen the village grow in size, and if not careful the village atmosphere would change. As for the proposed site near Keens Lane a most dangerous road to come out onto the Halesworth Road at any time of year. It would mean more cars on the already stretched roads. Also like all developments second homes for people outside of the area. Too many houses mean over development, and ruin the atmosphere of such a lovely area. One can see what happened to our neighbours in Southwold as a victim of its own success. Nearly all second houses priced out of young people's reach. Parking in the summer time is hopeless. Shops trying to find people to work in them. Even the prices of Reydon property is going up and up as people struggle to afford Southwold prices, and even Reydon now has many holiday homes. It must retain the countryside aspect, without becoming a concrete jungle.

As for building on St. Felix School playing fields that should be removed completely from consideration. It would spoil the whole outlook. Enough houses were built when St. George's Square was built. Enough is enough otherwise there is no end to development in the area.

As there is very little work apart from seasonal and retail it means more second homes which is ridiculous. More homes more traffic it is bad enough now. It would be a great shame to see the playing field built on, and lose more of the countryside that makes Reydon a village atmosphere. There is no industry here and prices are so high most of the young people move away, and you need a mixture of both young and old.

Do we need anymore development the answer is no. If we keep building at this rate all the villages will be joined up. Also with trees and countryside we have the pleasure of wildlife. Owls, bats and birds, and more.
Graham Denny

Section  
Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID  
908

Comment  
Both these areas are outside the physical / natural boundaries of Reydon and would create "sprawl" out into the countryside. There are other potential areas whilst outside the physical limits are within natural boundaries and do not create "sprawl".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Historic England Debbie Mack</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jean Crook</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jean Cuffe

Section Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID 912

Comment I very much object to houses being built on land opposite Keens Lane, Reydon 117 and 118 on the Southwold and Reydon development plan. The access for a start is terrible there being a hill and a dip in the road making it very much unaccessible. At weekends and holiday times the traffic build up along this road is terrible with cars gridlocked from Reydon corner back to Henham cross roads. What with that plus all the extra cars from this development would be catastrophic. The land is very good pasture land with Barn Owls hunting early morning and evening. They won’t be for locals, mostly retired or second homes or holiday homes. All this would put a terrible burden on our already stretched health centre. Because retired people move away from relatives who usually help out when ill. There is much more suitable places such as 142 where the fire station was and the plot opposite 142 which has stood empty derelict and an eye sore for ages. Also plot 26 where all these are on a bus route near shops built up areas with easy access to amenities. There are no facilities at all near plots 118 and 117 its just a very nice rural piece of farming land and way out of the village boundary line.
John Reaney

Section | Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID | 333

Comment | This comment relates to field represented as 'site 117' and adjoining arable farmland referred to as 'site 118'. The field (site 117) is separated from adjoining farmland (site 118) by an ancient hedge and a beautiful line of oak trees that create a wonderful pastoral view for anyone leaving or coming into Southwold on the Halesworth Rd. Also, the field, which is full of wildflowers in the summer, lends to the west side of Reydon a true country feel which makes it such an attractive place for residents and visitors to both Reydon and Southwold. To build on this field (site 117) would have a hugely detrimental impact on environs of Reydon and considerably lower the quality of life of the residents in Keens Lane and the adjoining roads. The building of 90 houses on this site would place a huge strain on existing utilities, especially sewage. Also there would be greater pressure placed on the sensitive heathland in the AONB near the marshes as these are likely to visited by many more people due to the additional people living nearby this site and at site 118 (600 houses proposed). I believe that all additional housing needs can be accommodated by utilising existing brownfield sites such as the redundant police station, fire station, garage and telephone exchange building. Also, land that is being sold by the local church will also be available for building houses.
John Reaney

Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID 394

Comment

This comment relates to the arable farming land referred to as 'site 118' and partly to the adjoining field referred to as '118'.

The farmland (site 117) is part of rolling pastoral landscape, which when viewed from the edge of Reydon, affords one of the most beautiful views in the county. Looking westward from Reydon on the Halesworth Rd., the eye is taken from the line of oak trees separating this site and the site 118, across the undulating fields of site 117 to the tower of St. Margaret's Church on the Wangford Rd. and then to the beautiful untouched countryside beyond. This view, which matches anything found in 'Constable' country around Dedham would be utterly destroyed if houses were built on this land.

Another aspect of the land of site 117, is that it can be so easily enjoyed by the public by walking along the lovely footpath that starts from the end of Keen's Lane and ends at St. Margaret's Church following the eastern boundary of site 117. Along this path there is an ancient hedgerow that terminates at the northeast corner of the site 117 where there is a glade of trees containing a pond. The footpath, because it well away from any built up area, is a wonderfully peaceful place to be, where one can listen to and observe the birds flitting from branch to branch amongst the trees that grow beside the hedgerow.

To build houses on site 117 (and adjoining site 118) would represent a huge loss of amenity to the residents of Reydon and to visitors to the area and could have a seriously detrimental effect on Reydon and Southwold as holiday destinations. No longer, would Southwold be seen as seaside town at the edge of the lovely Suffolk countryside; instead it would be viewed as place in the middle of a large conurbation which would, like so many other seaside places in the UK, be rather avoided by many people, who would prefer to holiday abroad.

The building of 600 houses (as indicated on the Waveney development plan map) would place a huge strain on existing utilities, especially sewage. Also there would be great pressure placed on the sensitive heathland in the area of AONB near the marshes as these are likely to be visited by many more people due to their easy access via Shepherds Lane.

To construct nearly a 1000 houses on the sites around Reydon makes no
sense due to the poor road links to Southwold and Reydon, and to the already overburdened utilities within this area. (Many residents have had problems with sewage disposal and power cuts often occur due to overloaded power lines). If there was really a need for an extra 1000 houses, then the planners should be looking at a new village/town near to the A12. (The A12 should also be improved by making it dual carriageway all the way from Ipswich to Lowestoft and there should be in addition a high speed rail link between the two towns).

I believe that all additional housing needs can be accommodated by utilising existing brownfield sites such as the redundant police station, fire station, garage and telephone exchange building.
Julian Lawrence

Section  
Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID  
98

Comment  
I think that scenario 1 option 1 would be more than enough for this area Reydon and Southwold have plenty of brown field sites and in fill sites earmarked already. For housing, this area is an area of ONB and encroaching on more green land is ludicrous. The services and utilities cannot cope as it is. Water/sewage is overstretched. The doctors dentist and school etc. has waiting lists and long waits for appointments already. Children are already being bussed out on mass as no secondary school. Traffic into Southwold and area is nonstop already on the Halesworth road and people in Keens lane and area already find it a problem to access the road. This would add to mass overdevelopment for a village that is at the edge of nowhere with hardly any employment. Where would all of the people work? They would have to commute adding to more pollution, road chaos and congestion. There are already enough second/holiday homes also in area so we do not need more of them either. Please be realistic about the future plans at least and choosing sites a community that just copes with its services and utilities and employment would be overwhelmed and change it completely.
Julie Church

Section: Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID: 358

Comment: When one looks at planning do they take into consideration the actually area. Here in Reydon we are at present a small community, there are very few jobs and the population is mainly middle aged or retired. Many of the homes here are second homes and there are many up for sale. Who will live in these proposed houses, there is nothing for young people, our high school was closed, and our surgery is very busy, with one having to wait 3 week for an appointment.

My view at present (I know I am lucky) is an open field, outside the village boundary. I see beautiful sunsets, owls flying every evening and bats. Birds are nesting in the hedges and the whole field has a look of old fashioned countryside. We now also have a view of Turbines at Holton and Solar panels filling a field.

Is progress always best, look what happened when high rise housing was built, perhaps that is what the council thinks we should have in Reydon????

Building new homes in Reydon, will be beneficial to those selling up from London, but will it really house those who are struggling on family credits?

The whole infrastructure of this area with Southwold, makes it difficult to expand. There is no parking in Southwold and no room to accommodate 100's of new homes, also the Halesworth Road is so busy in the Summer one cannot turn onto it from adjoining roads.

Please take my comments on board. and thank you for the opportunity to have a say on what happens in my beloved area.
Kevin Cross

**Section**  
Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

**Comment ID**  
28

**Comment**  
600 homes anywhere around this area would be shocking. Please all Parishes make sure that you have a good Neighbourhood Plan. The idea that there could ever be any building allowed on this land is shocking, and even more so as this proposal seems to be for a whole new estate of up to 600 homes. If that ever happened it would be a catastrophe for the approach to the Jewel in the Crown Town of Southwold, and urbanise yet another main Reydon Road.
**Kevin Kinsella**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Developing the land to the west of Keens Lane (690 homes in total) is wholly unacceptable, as that would completely alter the character of a town with a current population of around 2,500.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Margaret Dinn

Section  Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID  714

Comment  I strongly oppose the development of the fields to the west of Keens Lane and the Saint Felix playing fields (sites 117, 118, and 138) as: i/ access to these sites from the Halesworth Road (A1095) would be next to a blind comer-or in a blind dip and would increase traffic on a dangerous stretch of road; ii/ developing these areas of AONB land would have a massive impact on a landscape that forms a gateway to Southwold and Reydon; and iii/ developing sites 118 and 117 would create an urban sprawl and no doubt encourage the landowner to seek permission to fill-in the remaining land framed by the Adnams distribution centre and the solar farm.
Mr & Mrs McNally

Section Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID 207

Comment We attended the meeting on Tuesday 10 May to view the Waveney Local Plan. We were surprised to see so many homes planned for Reydon. Is there really a need for this amount of extra housing in this area? We asked the Planning Officer if the necessary infrastructure would be put in place prior to or at the same time the homes would be built. We were shocked to be told that this would not be the case and their remit was just to built houses and there was no link up with any necessary services. We pointed out that there are currently long waiting times for appointments at the Health Centre and treatment times at the James Paget A&E are below targets. The Planning Officer said that shortage of doctors is a nationwide problem and any improvements needed cannot be part of the housing development plan. There also appears to be no firm plans proposed for more school places, jobs, shops, sewage capacity etc. for the 972 homes mentioned.

It would appear that the area will be overdeveloped to provide housing with no thought for the well being of existing or new residents. Surely this cannot be right and we are writing to ask what action you will be taking. There is also the concern that a lot of the new property will be second homes and holiday lets and wonder if you will be considering adopting the St Ives ruling of not allowing this type of person to purchase new properties. This would make it less attractive to developers to build such large housing developments.

One last point when does a village enlarge so much to qualify to become a town?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Unsuitable. Urban development in an AONB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kerry Pace

Section  
Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID  
59

Comment  
The sheer scale of this proposition is beyond excessive. This would impact negatively on the whole area, and the effects would be widespread; the increased traffic, the environmental impact, and the overburdening of public services would be key issues. The general area would be changed beyond recognition and would result in a very 'built up' feeling. Who would buy these homes? Is there a need for so many locally? No is the short answer. Although all the potential sites may not be built upon, it seems that Reydon has been particularly singled out for massive development which (apart from the considerations already mentioned) would render the place completely charmless. The tourist trade is obviously really important to the area, and the entrance into Southwold would be impacted severely by the resulting additional traffic. The numbers are totally disproportionate to the local needs and population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pamela Morris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and Deborah Gillatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID 1132

Comment [Therefore,] none of the proposed large sites offered for development around Reydon (5,6,38, 117,18,138 in the options consultation, p51) will be needed and we believe these should not be considered for designation as development sites in the final Local Plan. Our residents strongly opposed the expansion of the village envelope in their response to the consultation for our Village Plan in 2014 which was confirmed more recently in the public response to the current application to develop land at St Felix School (site 138). There is simply no case for major development of housing or business accommodation on any of these sites, given the analysis of the housing needs set out above and the availability of undeveloped land at the current Reydon Business Park.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Many residents have moved here to live in a semi-natural area. These sites look like massive over-development. Second homes need to be controlled so that we can have local full time residents living here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sally Macnab

Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID: 143

Comment: As this is an AOB the building of housing in this area and 118 would be contrary to the provisions of an AOB. Waveney District Council counts Southwold and therefore Reydon because of the unique relationship as the jewel in the crown, if this is to continue then housing needs to be kept to what is genuinely needed and preferably using brown field site that will improve the area. Southwold is reliant on its tourism, the gate way is Reydon and therefore this area needs protecting. All of Waveney benefits from the tourism. The infrastructure of Reydon and Southwold (gas, water, drains, food shops and car parking) could not cope with large scale housing developments.
Simon Clack

Section  
Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon

Comment ID  947

Comment  
As regards the sites to the west and south of Keens Lane (site numbers 138, 116, and 117), I believe that they should all be excluded from any further consideration. The reasons for not developing the Saint Felix playing fields have already been well rehearsed (cf the comments made by local residents and organisations such as Sport England regarding planning reference: DC/15/3288/OUT) and many of the same arguments also apply to site numbers 116 and 117, specifically: a/ the land enjoys AONB status and there seems to be no reason why the Planning Inspectorates' recent decision regarding the proposed Reydon Smere development (cf APP/T3535/W/15/3131802) should not also apply to this area; b/ any vehicular access points from the A1095 would have to be located next to a blind corner or in a blind dip and would increase traffic on an already dangerous stretch of road. Any measures to remedy this situation (i.e. a roundabout) would only serve to further harm the character and appearance of the main gateway to Southwold & Reydon from the south; c/ developing these sites will encourage the landowner to fill-in the area between the solar farm and the Adnams distribution centre; and e/ the sites abut a pair of Grade II listed properties at the end of Keens Lane.
**Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O’Hear**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 117 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This extremely large site is remote from the boundary of the settlement of Reydon and in open countryside which is part of the AONB. It would, of course, only make sense to develop this site if the adjoining site to the east was also developed. This would thus add some 700 or more houses to the village - an extremely significant increase in its size. The road and sewage infrastructure are simply inadequate to deal with expansion on this scale. Moreover, there is absolutely no need for development on anything approaching this scale if the targets for new houses in Southwold and Reydon are to be met if the major growth in the District is based in and around Lowestoft. This makes most sens economically and in terms of regeneration and is our preferred option. The target for Southwold and Reydon can then be met by small scale development within the settlement boundaries or close to them along the line of the current Rural Exceptions Policy (DM22) for affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Anonymous

Section Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID 1228

Comment Key Questions Q5 Are there any areas of land you think are suitable or not suitable for development? Reydon - Rissemere Land and Easton Bavents are unsuitable - also the field across from Keens Lane. Could perhaps add some houses near Pitches View.
AR Hall & Sons
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section
Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID
770

Comment
The "Initial sustainability Appraisal of Emerging Options" paper is encouraging in that the only negative points identified relate to;
(A) "conserving and enhancing the quality and distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes"
(B) "reducing contributions to climate change and mitigate effects"
(C) "Conserving natural resources"
In response to item (A), whilst this is certainly a matter for consideration, we believe this potential issue can be addressed by the implementation of strategic landscaping in association with any future development, as well as the inclusion of attractive open space. With regard to items (B) and (C), considering Site 118 is Greenfield land, it is often the case that potential issues can be identified in relation to these matters, however given the scale of the site, and it's proximity to Site 117 (which we have also been submitted on behalf of our client) we believe that a potential development could be designed to involve particular features and infrastructure improvements to mitigate and counteract these potential issues.
The site extends to approximately 2.95 hectares and could accommodate up to approximately 90 dwellings (based on an assumed 30 dwellings per hectare). The site is within the sole ownership of our client and is considered suitable, available and deliverable in the next 1-5 years. Development of the site would represent a logical extension to the village along Halesworth Road. It is abutted by residential development to the east, and the southern boundary is formed of a public highway. As mentioned previously within this representation, the land to the west is also owned by our client, and further details regarding that site are set out overleaf.
Given the site's situation, we believe that it's development would certainly be suitable as it is easily serviceable and is adjacent to an existing public highway, making the provision of access to the site relatively simple. Given it's position, to the west of the centre of the village, potential associated traffic congestion issues would be minimal.
When considering potential employment growth within Waveney and it's surrounding districts, it is important to realise that Reydon is situated only
approximately 16.7 miles to the north of Sizewell, an area where there is likely to be considerable employment growth over the coming decade. Consequently, we believe that the site’s relative vicinity to this employment growth area helps to improve its sustainability.

Subsequent to the previous narrative, we consider the site to represent a sustainable opportunity for development and we look forward to continued engagement with the emerging Local Plan process in relation to this site.
G D Humphries

Section  Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID  888

Comment  As I have lived in Reydon for a great number of years I have seen the village grow in size, and if not careful the village atmosphere would change. As for the proposed site near Keens Lane a most dangerous road to come out onto the Halesworth Road at any time of year. It would mean more cars on the already stretched roads. Also like all developments second homes for people outside of the area. Too many houses mean over development, and ruin the atmosphere of such a lovely area. One can see what happened to our neighbours in Southwold as a victim of its own success. Nearly all second houses priced out of young people's reach. Parking in the summer time is hopeless. Shops trying to find people to work in them. Even the prices of Reydon property is going up and up as people struggle to afford Southwold prices, and even Reydon now has many holiday homes. It must retain the countryside aspect, without becoming a concrete jungle.

As for building on St. Felix School playing fields that should be removed completely from consideration. It would spoil the whole outlook. Enough houses were built when St. George's Square was built. Enough is enough otherwise there is no end to development in the area.

As there is very little work apart from seasonal and retail it means more second homes which is ridiculous. More homes more traffic it is bad enough now. It would be a great shame to see the playing field built on, and lose more of the countryside that makes Reydon a village atmosphere.

There is no industry here and prices are so high most of the young people move away, and you need a mixture of both young and old.

Do we need anymore development the answer is no. If we keep building at this rate all the villages will be joined up. Also with trees and countryside we have the pleasure of wildlife. Owls, bats and birds, and more.
G Golding

Section Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID 91

Comment Site 118 is outside the built-up area and the village boundary, both in contravention of planning rules, is green belt, in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, has significant archaeological interest and would also damage the approach to Southwold, and would adversely affect the dwellings in Keens Lane and adding more traffic to already a busy and dangerous road.
Graham Denny

Section
Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID
909

Comment
Both these areas are outside the physical / natural boundaries of Reydon and would create "sprawl" out into the countryside. There are other potential areas whilst outside the physical limits are within natural boundaries and do not create "sprawl".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Gorse Lodge Farmhouse Grade II to north. Potential impact on setting of Listed Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jean Crook

Section  
Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID  622

Comment  
Object to any building outside the current boundary of village, this site is far too large and would attract second home owners and not support local people to buy properties in the local area. Access to this site would be from the main road into Southwold which is busy and dangerous, there would be no access from Keens Lane which is a private road.
Jean Cuffe

Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID 913

I very much object to houses being built on land opposite Keens Lane, Reydon 117 and 118 on the Southwold and Reydon development plan. The access for a start is terrible there being a hill and a dip in the road making it very much unaccessible. At weekends and holiday times the traffic build up along this road is terrible with cars gridlocked from Reydon corner back to Henham cross roads. What with that plus all the extra cars from this development would be catastrophic. The land is very good pasture land with Barn Owls hunting early morning and evening. They won’t be for locals, mostly retired or second homes or holiday homes. All this would put a terrible burden on our already stretched health centre. Because retired people move away from relatives who usually help out when ill. There is much more suitable places such as 142 where the fire station was and the plot opposite 142 which has stood empty derelict and an eye sore for ages. Also plot 26 where all these are on a bus route near shops built up areas with easy access to amenities. There are no facilities at all near plots 118 and 117 its just a very nice rural piece of farming land and way out of the village boundary line.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jim Elmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julian Lawrence

Section  Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID  96

Comment  I think that scenario 1 option 1 would be more than enough for this area. Reydon and Southwold have plenty of brownfield sites and infill sites earmarked already for housing. This area is an area of ONB and encroaching on more green land is ludicrous. The services and utilities cannot cope as it is. Water/sewage is overstretched, the doctors, dentist, and school etc. have waiting lists and long waits for appointments already. Children are already being bussed out on mass as no secondary school. Traffic into Southwold and area is non-stop already on the Halesworth road and people in Keens lane and area already find it a problem to access the road. This would add to mass overdevelopment for a village that is at the edge of nowhere with hardly any employment. Where would all of the people work? They would have to commute adding to more pollution, road chaos and congestion. There are already enough second/holiday homes also in area so we do not need more of them either. Please be realistic about the future plans at least and choosing sites a community that just copes with its services and utilities and employment would be overwhelmed and change it completely.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Lawrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Kinsella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Margaret Dinn

Section  Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID  715

Comment  I strongly oppose the development of the fields to the west of Keens Lane and the Saint Felix playing fields (sites 117, 118, and 138) as: i/ access to these sites from the Halesworth Road (A1095) would be next to a blind corner-or in a blind dip and would increase traffic on a dangerous stretch of road; ii/ developing these areas of AONB land would have a massive impact on a landscape that forms a gateway to Southwold and Reydon; and iii/ developing sites 118 and 117 would create an urban sprawl and no doubt encourage the landowner to seek permission to fill-in the remaining land framed by the Adnams distribution centre and the solar farm
Mr & Mrs McNally

Section Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID 208

Comment We attended the meeting on Tuesday 10 May to view the Waveney Local Plan. We were surprised to see so many homes planned for Reydon. Is there really a need for this amount of extra housing in this area? We asked the Planning Officer if the necessary infrastructure would be put in place prior to or at the same time the homes would be built. We were shocked to be told that this would not be the case and their remit was just to built houses and there was no link up with any necessary services. We pointed out that there are currently long waiting times for appointments at the Health Centre and treatment times at the James Paget A&E are below targets. The Planning Officer said that shortage of doctors is a nationwide problem and any improvements needed cannot be part of the housing development plan. There also appears to be no firm plans proposed for more school places, jobs, shops, sewage capacity etc. for the 972 homes mentioned.

It would appear that the area will be overdeveloped to provide housing with no thought for the well being of existing or new residents. Surely this cannot be right and we are writing to ask what action you will be taking. There is also the concern that a lot of the new property will be second homes and holiday lets and wonder if you will be considering adopting the St Ives ruling of not allowing this type of person to purchase new properties. This would make it less attractive to developers to build such large housing developments.

One last point when does a village enlarge so much to qualify to become a town?
Parke

Section  Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID  12

Comment  Unacceptable urbanisation of rural landscape in an AONB.
Comment ID 620

Comment

This land backs onto Keens Lane a private road, this lane at the best of times is practically impossible to exit/ enter due to large amounts of traffic on the Halesworth Road entering Reydon (turning right out of lane is very dangerous) peaking during summer months to a near stand still from Southwold to St Felix School. Building a possible 761 houses (sites 118/117/138) off the Halesworth Road would make this situation impossible. Traffic chaos. The infrastructure in Reydon could not cope with such large increases in housing, roads, schools, shops, parking. Who would these houses be for, affordable houses for locals? As with all the others that have been built before, sold on to second home owners and holiday lets. If all the second homes/ holiday lets in Reydon/ Southwold had been prevented there would be no need for new houses to be built especially on AONB, supposedly protected, land.
Pamela Morris

Section  Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID  309

Comment  Please delete areas in 117, 118, 138
All these are large areas and all off the very busy rural A1095. Any development in any one of these areas would be in excess of the % new dwellings sought and would change a village to a town. This is an area where affordable homes are not required; developers would building houses as holiday or second homes for excess profit. Very many other reasons could be given.
Peter and Deborah Gillatt

Section: Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID: 657

Comment: We do not support the development of plots 117 and 118 west of Keens Lane because such a development would be out of scale to the current village size, swamping it and changing its character detrimentally.
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

Comment ID 1133

Comment [Therefore,] none of the proposed large sites offered for development around Reydon (5,6,38, 117,18,138 in the options consultation, p51) will be needed and we believe these should not be considered for designation as development sites in the final Local Plan. Our residents strongly opposed the expansion of the village envelope in their response to the consultation for our Village Plan in 2014 which was confirmed more recently in the public response to the current application to develop land at St Felix School (site 138). There is simply no case for major development of housing or business accommodation on any of these sites, given the analysis of the housing needs set out above and the availability of undeveloped land at the current Reydon Business Park.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ruth &amp; John Pigneguy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Simon Clack**

**Section**

Potential land for development 118 - Land to the west of Laurel Farm (primary area), Reydon

**Comment ID**

948

**Comment**

As regards the sites to the west and south of Keens Lane (site numbers 138, 116, and 117), I believe that they should all be excluded from any further consideration. The reasons for not developing the Saint Felix playing fields have already been well rehearsed (cf the comments made by local residents and organisations such as Sport England regarding planning reference: DC/15/3288/OUT) and many of the same arguments also apply to site numbers 116 and 117, specifically: a/ the land enjoys AONB status and there seems to be no reason why the Planning Inspectorates' recent decision regarding the proposed Reydon Smere development (cf APP/T3535/W/15/3131802) should not also apply to this area; b/ any vehicular access points from the A1095 would have to be located next to a blind corner or in a blind dip and would increase traffic on an already dangerous stretch of road. Any measures to remedy this situation (i.e. a roundabout) would only serve to further harm the character and appearance of the main gateway to Southwold & Reydon from the south; c/ developing these sites will encourage the landowner to fill-in the area between the solar farm and the Adnams distribution centre; and e/ the sites abut a pair of Grade II listed properties at the end of Keens Lane.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 119 - Land to the west of St Edmunds Church, Kessingland

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 119 - Land to the west of St Edmunds Church, Kessingland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Adjacent to Church of St Edmund grade I listed. Potential impact on setting of high grade listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Janis Roberts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 119 - Land to the west of St Edmunds Church, Kessingland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Why on earth would you build on green belt when the old Ashley nursery site sits empty and derelict? Start destroying green belt and you destroy our beautiful land for future generations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Potential land for development 119 - Land to the west of St Edmunds Church, Kessingland

Comment ID 988

Comment With regards to site 85 (Rider Haggard Lane), site 109 (London Road) and sites 119 and 125 (Church Road) – none of the landowners came forward during the 4 years that the Neighbourhood Plan has been in progress, except the owner of sites 119 and 125 (part of these sites are being used as allotments), who stated that they didn't want to be part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. These two sites which are south of Church Road are part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) bordering the Kessingland Levels, and are not sites suitable for development.

Excluding site 41, which has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan, these 4 sites in total would bring forward 100 homes.

The Neighbourhood Plan, which is as a result of 4 years consultation with landowners and the local community brings forward 3 sites which would bring forward a total of 105 homes plus in the case of site SA1 a commercial incubator facility, in respect of site SA2 a new playing field recreation area extension and in the case of SA3 affordable homes held in perpetuity for the residents of Kessingland.

Therefore the 4 sites put forward in the Waveney Local Plan are considered to be surplus to the requirements of Kessingland, the 'Housing Needs Survey' figures are more than covered by the Neighbourhood Plan proposals, which should be included in the Waveney Local Plan in preference to the other sites put forward.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 119 - Land to the west of St Edmunds Church, Kessingland

Comment ID 766

Comment Based on aerial photographs, sites 41; 85; 109 and 119 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.
Potential land for development 120 - Land west of London Road, Wrentham

Benacre Estates Company  Edward Vere Nicoll
Savills (Philip Rankin)

Section  Potential land for development 120 - Land west of London Road, Wrentham

Comment ID  819

Comment  Land to the west of London Road, Wrentham, was submitted to the Council’s Call for Sites in October 2015. The site is located to the south west of the village and is enclosed by residential development to the north, south and south east. It is not constrained by any landscape or flood risk designations (as identified on the adopted Proposals Map (2012) and Environment Agency Flood Maps). It is anticipated access will be taken from the A12 which forms the eastern boundary of the site. The site is within the sole ownership of our client and it is considered suitable, available and deliverable in the next 1-5 years.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section | Potential land for development 120 - Land west of London Road, Wrentham

Comment ID | 1071

Comment | Proximity of several grade II listed buildings including County Primary School and walling, Clyfton House and 30 - 32 London Road. Potential impact upon setting of Listed building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID</strong></th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>20 Homes in this location seems like a great idea to me. I live in the village and would be in favour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrentham Parish Council Frances Bullard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 120 - Land west of London Road, Wrentham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>As a Parish Council we would ask that previous concerns re density, infrastructure, recreational space, parking &amp; increased traffic are taken into account when any planning application is considered for this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential land for development 121 - Land west of Moores Cottages, Holton

**Halesworth Town Council N Rees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 121 - Land west of Moores Cottages, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Similarly, Sites 73 and 121,103, 148 are classified as Holton and HTC and Holton would need to look at this together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 121 - Land west of Moores Cottages, Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to Moat Farm house, grade II. Potential impact on setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 121 - Land west of Moores Cottages, Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 73; 121 Both these sites look to be outside the village envelope but there is already a 'local community' in this area and an innovative, environmentally designed scheme for local need could be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 122 - Land west of Norwich Road, north of Old Station Road, Halesworth

Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section Potential land for development 122 - Land west of Norwich Road, north of Old Station Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 1196

Comment The sites further north 106,140,141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town. There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section  Potential land for development 122 - Land west of Norwich Road, north of Old Station Road, Halesworth

Comment ID  840

Comment  Site 122 with the potential of 150 houses, site 106 with 27 and site 140 with the potential of 30 houses is an area where drainage and water and sewage have already been raised as potentially problematic. 207 houses is far too many. Site 141 is in Wissett and this would add another 30 houses, making 237 in all. The Wissett Road is heavily used and would be inadequate if these houses were erected. The traffic on Wissett Road is a potential hazard for the pupils of Edgar Sewtwer School now, this development would make it much worse. Similarly the infrastructure of school places, doctors' surgeries and the current sewage system would all need considerable improvement.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section Potential land for development 122 - Land west of Norwich Road, north of Old Station Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 1073

Comment Wissett Place, grade II located to south east of site. Potential impact on setting of listed building.
### Hopkins Homes Christopher Smith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 122 - Land west of Norwich Road, north of Old Station Road, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Following the previous Representations made to the 'Call for Sites' Consultation in January 2016, Hopkins Homes would re-affirm the suitability of Site 122 to provide for sustainable housing development, incorporating new public open space, as detailed upon the previously submitted Feasibility Layout Plan. The site lies in a highly sustainable location, within walking distance to the town centre and railway station and is surrounded by built development. The 4.9Ha site is suitable to accommodate a development of approximately 150 dwellings, together with new public open space. Vehicular access can be gained from the A144 Norwich Road, with pedestrian linkages also available through to the existing public open space to the north of Old Station Road. Feasibility sketch and site boundary attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Halesworth &amp; Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 122 - Land west of Norwich Road, north of Old Station Road, Halesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Site 122 encroaches on the buffer zone between the industrial site on Norwich Road and housing on Old Station Road. This site also has major drainage implications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tony Langford

Section: Potential land for development 122 - Land west of Norwich Road, north of Old Station Road, Halesworth

Comment ID: 45

Comment: If more land needed after the 'Tesco' site and Dairy Hill developments, this would be one of the better options and is easier walking distance to town than some.
Potential land for development 123 - Lock’s Road, Westhall

Ann Trodd

Section Potential land for development 123 - Lock’s Road, Westhall

Comment ID 92

Comment This site has been investigated before. There is an insufficient sewage system in this area as it is. These tiny lanes will not take all these extra cars - remember every house will generate TWO cars nowadays. There is a not a bus service suitable for people to work so they will ALL have cars. All this extra traffic meeting the huge farm vehicles? Accidents waiting to happen. Local primary schools are already full. Socially it is unacceptable to increase small villages by high volume building. The incoming residents outnumber the existing number of households and this causes social unrest. Increasing houses by one or two at a time, infilling where possible is the way to build a community so that newcomers can be assimilated without causing local resentment.

This is just a local farmer wanting to cash in.
Anna JordanSmith

Section  Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID  269

Comment  As a resident of Locks Rd we enjoy very much the farm fields and outstanding views over the fields beyond. We have all purchased a home with a beautiful view to enjoy which will be destroyed by the injection of some many new homes.

This field is a haven for wildlife, birds and helps maintain the tranquility of the village. An increase of this many houses will create a lot more noise and all in a very condensed area of space. There will be little space inside of the village for animals to rome free.

This village does not have the infrastructure to maintain any substantial increase in road use which an increase of over 30 homes to a small area will create. Our roads are very small and there is very little of our roads were two cars can pass on the roads side by side. This is never more evident than coming into the village at both the north and south ends. In fact outside the potential site the road is small.

However this perfect for the villages at present, it maintains a slow flow of the little traffic we have. This would be lot with increase of the cars servicing the new homes.

It would be a massive shame to lose the space we have and the atmosphere we are lucky to have and appreciate in our small village. It is a very large injection of housing in a very small space.

I am sure I speak for many others who object to this potential Project, from Locks Rd and all other places within the village.
Anne O'Connor

Section: Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID: 517

Comment:
We would like to voice our concerns regarding the proposed building of over 30 houses in the land behind Locks Road. Our house backs onto the proposed development, so from a personal viewpoint we are concerned that it will spoil the open rural view at the rear of our garden which we have enjoyed since moving into our house almost 20 years ago.

From a more objective viewpoint, we think that the relatively large number of houses proposed would be too great for the local infrastructure to cope with.

We understand that the current population increase means that more houses are needed. In the case of Westhall it would be more appropriate to build small numbers of houses on a few different sites. This would better maintain the character of the village and new residents would find it easier to be absorbed into village life rather than all be clumped together on the edge of the village.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Belinda Lee</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christopher Lynch

Section  
Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID  
518

Comment  
Nothing has changed since the previous failed application to develop this site 10 years ago, we have same infrastructure supporting the Parish, but added demands since that time time of:

a) greater traffic density
b) higher demand for drainage, with many drainage ditches lost
C) increase in delivery vehicle e.g. Internet sales/no gas supply, therefore greater reliance on oil tender deliveries
d) narrow roads with a lack of suitable passing places/damage to roads and verges
e) no school within the Parish/more school bus transport
f) medical facilities at bursting point

Regards,
Chris & Valerie Lynch
Cubitt

Section | Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID | 563

Comment | Westhall is a village of ribbon development and the proposed type of development would be a departure, and change the character of the village. There are a number of existing sites available for ribbon development that should be utilised before any development of this type is considered.

The road connections to Westhall are of poor quality and whilst they may not need widening the quality of the roads should be reviewed and upgraded before such development is considered.

Sewerage treatment services have not changed for many years and would probably need investment prior to further development.
David Thompson

Section  
Potential land for development 123 - Lock’s Road, Westhall

Comment ID  520

Comment  
This site has been the discussion of future housing development in Westhall for several decades. Whilst there is potential for a small, limited development of between 5-10 properties the idea that 37 new houses could be built there is impractical given the nature of Westhall. Westhall is a small rural community with limited facilities. The roads in the area are all single track and barely suitable for the existing traffic demands. There is no school, there are very limited employment prospects in the locality, the utility services are poor (limited sewage treatment, very old and frequently unreliable overhead power and telephone systems and the broadband service is pathetic) I consider a large scale development at Lock’s road to be totally impractical and unsuitable for a small rural community. I ask Waveney District Council to reject this proposal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Donna Southwell</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | I would like to express my concerns regarding this planned housing development. Westhall is a small, rural village and is not big enough to handle an extra 37 households. There is no school in the village or within walking distance, there is also no employment in the village as we are very rural. The services are not great now and these extra houses would strain an already over worked system, we have poor sewage works, no gas supply and a very poor internet connection.

The village would not handle the extra traffic either, the roads are very narrow and we already have extra commuters cutting through the village to avoid the A12.

I believe we should keep Westhall as it is until we manage to resolve the issues current residents have before adding new ones. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edward Lynch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Helen Marr

Section        Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID    393

Comment        Most villages need 'new blood' and Westhall is no exception. However, it is clear that the present infrastructure and services are not sufficient to accommodate more properties, let alone the number suggested. The village is already under pressure due to increased traffic, verges destroyed due to larger farm vehicles and parking problems, further housing would only exacerbate these problems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Historic England Debbie Mack</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Jackson

Section Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID 328

Comment I am the owner of property at Locks Rd and the plot in question sits directly behind my house. It is, apparently, not owned by a resident of Westhall, but owned by someone in another village. My understanding of the consultation is that it involves a proposal to build up to 37 houses on this lot, with an access point just down from the already existing terraced houses off of Locks Rd. It is also my understanding that a similar proposal for approximately 44 houses was turned down nearly 10 years ago. The reason for the refusal, which was a wise move, was the lack of adequate infrastructure.

In principle, I am not opposed to building new homes where they are needed and in appropriate locations, making use of brownfield sites as a priority rather than greenfield sites as the first option. However, I do oppose the building of houses on this site, for the following reasons. First, this site is directly behind my house and the lay of the land is such, the water run off and drainage would be a problem. The houses now on Locks Rd. along this field sit below the field and run off and drainage would be a concern. Further, 37 houses in that space would leave little room for green spaces and buffers for the existing properties. Secondly, to pack 37 houses into this area would create an unsustainable and dangerous amount of traffic on Locks Rd., which is little more than a single track road, indeed all of the roads servicing Westhall are little more than single track roads. All roads in this area have many passing places to allow cars to pull over so two can pass. Large farm machinery regularly travels these roads and an increase in traffic would make this work difficult for farmers. The roads are simply not capable of taking on an increase in traffic. The village is currently not a rat run, but would be and would create a problem for dog walkers and families who walk along these roads. In addition, this area, and especially Locks Rd. is a popular and safe route at the moment for horse riders, hikers and cyclists. Adding 37 houses to this area would create an unsafe environment for these activities. Thirdly, the infrastructure that was present when the council turned down the last proposal has not changed. Westhall has the same sewer system, continues to have no natural gas available (which would necessitate more and more oil trucks in and out of the village), has no school with in either walking or cycling distance, The broadband and phone signals are mostly inadequate. In short, the
infrastructure not only has not changed, but, given the advances in modern technology, probably has fallen behind. 37 houses would not benefit from this area, in other words.

I am aware that the village council is unanimously opposed to this proposal and so are every other resident that I have spoken to, and that is most. Please do not consider this for development, there are better sites in the area closer to more appropriate facilities.

Thank you.
Section  
Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID  
405

Comment  
No gas in the village so more oil tankers Narrow rural lanes in and around village Same small sewage works No employment at all as rural Small school and have to wait for places Fram vehicles regularly using theses roads there as wide as the road Poor moblie access Poor internet access The opening to the site is only wide eought for one car Water pump house in halesworth needs up grading to take more housing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Katie Johnson</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kevin & Mary Roe

Section Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID 332

Comment A similar proposal for 44 houses in the same location was turned down 10 years ago! Since then NOTHING has changed!
The village has the same infrastructure
? same small sewage works and many existing properties not on mains drainage
? small village shop
? no school in village - nearest primary school 3 miles away not within walking distance
? no employment at all as completely rural
? no mains gas supply to village (this would necessitate more oil tankers delivering)
? already poor internet access
? all lanes rightfully narrow as this is a rural location
? traffic would increase on these rural roads as additional people commute out of village to work and schools
? there is already an increase in traffic from existing growing families within the village
? roads in the village already becoming more dangerous with higher and wider farm vehicles and commuters already
Using the village as a cut through to the A12
? we live at number 1 locks road with a blind entrance which is already dangerous to come in and out of with existing traffic volume - extra village volume will cause concern regarding childrens' welfare when going out and about in the village.
? we have lived here for 21 years and in this time we have already seen our verges and hedgerow eroded by existing traffic with a potential 37 more properties with an average of 2 vehicles each this can only get worse!
? this village prides itself with a quiet safe community and the ability to let our children play out 'in the old fashioned way,'
? our country roads are already full of potholes and uneven surfaces, which aren’t maintained satisfactorily to cope with current traffic volume - surely money would be better spent maintaining what we already have rather than putting further strain on resources throughout our village!
? why doesn’t the farmer put in for planning for new houses next to his own home in his own village?
Kevin Grantham

Section  
Potential land for development 123 - Lock’s Road, Westhall

Comment ID  
401

Comment  
The potential development site behind Locks Road, Westhall would create the following problems and my family strongly objects to the development on site 123:
* There is a lack of suitable access roads and paths to accommodate the additional houses. The roads and paths are already below the standards needed, especially with the large commercial and farm vehicles regularly transiting through the village. There is already a risk to pedestrians travelling around the village due to the inadequate infrastructure. The risk of a foreseeable serious injury or fatality in the village would certainly be increased.
* The school is at capacity and would be unable to accommodate additional children.
* There is no suitable gas main into the village, therefore more HGV oil Lorries would be needed to serve the community.
* The sewage system is at capacity and would be unable to cope with the additional load. Some houses do not have mains sewage already in the village.
* There is already inadequate internet access in the village, additional houses would make this even worse.
* Limited local employment would make the rural roads even more congested and dangerous during the commuter periods.
* We purchased our house for its rural setting and field views etc. This development would certainly destroy this. On purchasing our house we checked about future developments with the relevant authorities and farmer concerned, both confirmed that future development would not happen.
* There are other sites in the local area which are nearer the main roads with better infrastructure which could be developed if required.
Lorraine Knight

Section  
Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID  
410

Comment  
I consider this site to be completely unsuitable for development! To put these houses on this site would be equivalent to creating an estate in a rural location!
There simply is not the infrastructure in place in this small village:
* small sewage works
* small local shop
* small school on outskirts of village not within walking distance
* no employment as completely rural
* no gas supply
* poor internet access
* narrow lanes & roads (higher & wider farm vehicles regularly use these, as do existing residents, delivery drivers & commuters to avoid the A 12)
* no train station
The population is aware that new development maybe inevitable, but where people are not adding to a location but commuting away from it, surely it would be more appropriate for ribbon development, infilling small spaces on the OUTSKIRTS where amenities are already available and access to main roads, train stations etc is already in place!!
Madeline Prasser

Section
Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID
466

Comment
It would be ridiculous to allow this many homes to be built in our small village. We already struggle day to day on the roads, which are all single track with passing places (and even more dangerous at this time of year when the verges are very high and visibility is awful, many near misses). Roads aren't in particularly good condition and would be made even worse with an additional 70 odd vehicles using them. Internet provision is poor as we are so far from the exchange, without the possibility improvement in the foreseeable future. Children have to be bused to nearby schools. There just isn't the infrastructure in place to cope with this many additional homes. At the moment we do have a Village Shop, but it is unlikely to remain once the current shop keeper retires, he is 91 this summer! No mains gas supply and also the sewage works are apparently at capacity.

From a personal point of view, we chose to live in our house because of the beautiful outlook to the rear, overlooking rural fields. I think I share the view, certainly of ALL of the residents along Locks Road, that this would completely ruin our houses. I moved here to NOT be overlooked and if houses were put on the proposed site we certainly would be. It would definitely cause a loss of value to current properties.

I am not against any development in the village, but there must be better sites and for a fraction of the amount of houses i.e. 5 or 6!

Houses were turned down on this site because of these very reasons 10 years ago and NOTHING has changed.

Please, please do not consider this site a possibility. You will completely ruin our village.
**Mark and Joy Moore**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>As long time residents of Locks Road we wish to state that we strongly oppose the proposed housing development in our road. There are no amenities such as sewage and gas etc. and in our opinion would destroy the fabric of the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lynch

Section Potential land for development 123 - Lock’s Road, Westhall

Comment ID 577

Comment Dear Sir/Madam,
I would like to comment on the proposed site for housing development on Lock’s Road, Westhall (Numbered 123).
I believe that the site is unsuitable for housing development due to the lack of infrastructure supporting the village. The village is accessed only by single lane rural roads and are already busy with traffic from the current residents, large farm vehicles and other delivery vans. There are also minimal services provided in the village with there being only a small shop, a very poor internet connection, no gas supply and infrequent public transport. A lack of local employment opportunities would mean that any new residents would have to travel a minimum of five miles to the nearest town or ten miles to the next. No school within walking distance would also increase road traffic and limit opportunities for children. An absence of sewage/water treatment works and drainage provision that could cope with extra housing is also a concern because when there is heavy rain the current roads flood quickly.
Regards.
Nathan Tonkes

Section  
Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID  
350

Comment  
The village is too small for development. The roads are too small for development. The drains are too small for development. We already struggle with the WiFi. There has been no proper warning or information for all locals to find out about this and have their say. It was denied before and nothing has changed except more people use the roads due to multiple cars on existing houses and with other road uses cutting through the village. Not to mention the farm vehicles are getting much bigger. The village is a beautiful village as it is and I would personally hate to see it change. I'm all for development just not on the doorstep of existing houses. It would be a real shame to see the village change just to see someone get rich.

I hope there will be a proper meeting held where everyone is invited and not done in secret so no one turns up. This should have a proper vote.
Patsy Knight

Section  Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID  706

Comment  Westhall Site 123 - potential land for development 37 houses in Locks Road is just ridiculous, the roads are too narrow and even now with the traffic flowing through buses/tractors, they are all tearing up our grass verges. There is no infrastructure for future development. One shop and a pub which keeps on closing and re-opening, who is to say they will both be here next year. I am not against development a few houses each year in Westhall is fine, but not mass development. I love this village and do not wanted it turned into a sprawl.
Peter and Ann Mulley

Section: Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID: 904

Comment: We oppose the proposal to build 38 houses on this site. 38 is in excess of what is widely considered to be the amount of new housing that can be successfully integrated into an existing community of this size. The local infrastructure is far from adequate and would require considerable investment in:

- Sewerage treatment capacity.
- Narrow roads already stressed by more and larger farm traffic, increased use by commuters, present resident children using car ownership age.
- Schools not just the local primary at the next village of Ilketshall but also the secondary at Bungay.
- Very poor internet access.
Red Bird Publishing Michael Barnes

Section Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID 327

Comment I can not even fathom how a potential site for 38 houses in a very small village like Westhall would even be considered for development. If this development went ahead it would increase the housing population in the village by just under a third. This is a small rural location which has been farmed for years, turning this into a major housing site would cause no end of problems.

I moved to the village a few years ago as the country lifestyle was what we wanted after living in busy towns previously. The view from my windows is currently out over beautiful farm landscape. Now the possibility of a concrete jungle being at the bottom of my garden is not a great prospect. In fact if this did go ahead we would leave the village, its as simple as that. This would effect the value of my house and many others in the village because it would not be a pleasant place to live. The extra traffic and people would create much more noise than we are all used to, it simply would not be acceptable.

The infrastructure of the small village I live in is just not good enough for these extra dwellings. As I understand it this exact plot was put up for possible development in the previous proposal some 10-15 years ago. It was rejected back then as the infrastructure was not good enough then and now in the years that have passed nothing, yes nothing has changed.

Lets start with the roads. The village only has roads that are big enough for one vehicle to pass. In order to pass others, both vehicles have to mount verges or find one of the very few passing places. We are a farming community and have lots of large farming vehicles/machinery using the roads on a daily basis. Combines, Tractors, large lorries etc this all with the vehicles of those that already live in the village. The prospect of 38 houses worth of additional vehicles (say 2 per household) would mean a massive increase in cars, vans etc coming and going every day. The increase in vehicles using the roads in the few years we have lived in the village has increased no end. Many ignoring the 30mph speed limit and endangering horse riders and cyclists that use the village roads regularly.

Employment. In this village there are 2 places where you can work. The pub or the village shop, both of which may be closing down in the near future for various reasons. This housing development would increase people commuting in and out of the village looking for work. Something again our
roadways would not handle very well at all!!
Schooling. The local schools are already struggling with the amount of children locally. I have a young 16 month old and have been advised by the local schools to apply for her school place now as she may not be accepted. All these extra people coming into the village would no doubt have extra children making it harder for those that already live locally to get their school placements!!!
Mobile phone signal for many different users is non-existent. Broadband speeds are dreadful and very slow as the cables that supply the village are old copper cables. These would need a major upgrade to provide these extra dwellings.
Our Parish Council are against this development as they think it would cause many major issues for the village life of many residents.
I sincerely hope that this development is ignored as Westhall is not a good choice at all for such a major increase in population.
Thank you for your time
Sally Self

Section  Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID  430

Comment  I registered to object to the development off locks road for several reasons. Firstly the increase in traffic on narrow country roads particularly lorries if it goes ahead; Pressure on the local schools both primary and secondary; Drainage and sewers not good if problems occur to those directly backing onto the site; Also the landowner in question does not live in the village and hasn't bothered to ask the views of those who will be directly affected. My views from my garden will be ruined.
I sincerely hope any objections are seriously considered as many of my neighbours are also upset by this news too.
Stacey Howlett

Section

Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID

406

Comment

We do not agree with having more houses in Westhall, we may have a shop and a pub, but the roads can not withstand any more people or traffic, you only have to look at the destruction of the verges in the main part of the village to see the damage that already occurs with the volume of traffic we have already.

With the level of cars and the huge buses that come through, the buses are completely unsuitable for our small roads, the farming tractors and equipment are getting bigger and HAVE to come through the village, it wouldn't be the first time a tractor has not been able to get through because cars are in the way.

We do not have a school in the village or any form of employment, which means traffic constantly in and out of the village for these purposes, the roads only have a small number of layby's to get through as it is, if more cars come in, you are not going to be able to move, we do not the facilities or roads to be able to take any more traffic - if we were talking a couple of houses it would be different - BUT 37 houses, probably families, so 2 cars per house (1 for mum & 1 for dad) that is an extra 74 cars, plus visitors.

I live in a quiet village as a choice, I do NOT want more houses, the village is completely unsuitable for this - I don't care how much money is going to go in someone's pocket, I do not want to look out on houses, if I did I would live in a town.
Stephen Gray

Section Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID 330

Comment A potential development of 37 houses would increase the size of our village by 26% which the sewers, roads etc cannot cope with, also there is no mains gas and internet access is poor. Our village has already been blighted by the nearby wind farm which would put off potential purchasers anyway. It is debatable if there is the demand for such a large no. of houses in a village with very poor transport link, no school and poor public transport.
Dear Sir / Madam
I have studied the proposed building development for 44 houses at Locks Road in Westhall and find the scale of the project alarming for our small rural village. There is a very limited infrastructure in the village that currently struggles to serve the existing residents in the village. My understanding is that the sewer facilities are at full capacity so much so that the house that I live in, built over 20 year ago, is not on the mains sewerage system. The internet and broadband facilities are not adequate and the connection is slow and patchy in the village. At present we have small shop and post office but there have been numerous attempts to close it and with the post master aged 90 it is unlikely to be kept open after his retirement. The local schools are full and some distance away and would certainly require a but to be provided for the children to get to them. There is a bus service again at present through the village. it has been drastically reduced over the recent years and now only provides a service through the village 4 times a day. The first bus to come through the village is the school bus which has no room for the general public and the next service is at 10am which is not compatible with usual working hours.
Whilst I understand that land for housing is essential and I am not against some building in the village it is the scale of the project that I am objecting to and it's significant impact on the village and lack of infrastructure to support such a scale of housing. I think my concerns are shared by many other Westhall residents and I hope councillors will listen and consider the views of the people who live in this village and know it well.
Yours faithfully
Linda Ashford
Westhall Parish Council Ann Donnachie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Westhall PC wrote to WDC about the draft Local Plan on 6th April 2016, having also imparted information about the parish at a meeting in Lowestoft to which we were invited in 2015. The following are relevant extracts from our e-mail:

"Westhall has approximately 140 households spread over a large agricultural area served by single track roads with passing places. The centre of the village is concentrated around Wangford Road, which is also an agricultural thoroughfare and so is in frequent use by large vehicles and machinery. The junction of Nollers Lane, the single track road from the village, with the A143 is narrow with poor visibility and there is little scope for widening and improved sight lines due to existing buildings. Many properties in Westhall lack mains drainage and there is no piped gas. Telephone coverage is unreliable due to our distance from the exchange and the age of the copper cabling, and BT Openreach has said a fibre optic replacement would be uneconomic." 
"Meaningful development within any part of the parish would therefore require a considerable investment in infrastructure and so it would seem unlikely that the parish would appeal to developers. Further, in a 2008 opinion poll the majority of parishioners stated that they did not wish to see any substantial change in the nature and size of the village. That view has not changed: in the last two months fewer than 10 responses have been received to the Parish Council's request for parishioner input, only one of which supported any form of development."

In light of the above facts, in particular the inadequacy of the road network within and around the village, the Parish Council has serious concerns about the suitability of this site, or indeed any site within the parish, for a 26% increase in the number of dwellings.
Westhall Village David Christian

Section Potential land for development 123 - Lock's Road, Westhall

Comment ID 475

Comment I believe that this would cause problems within the village due to?
Narrow Roads
Sewer system I am not directory on main drains
Schools
No Gas - oil heating - large lorries
Movement of large farm equipment
I appreciate that housing in needed but in our village another 37 houses
would cause problems as listed above
Regards David d d Christian
Potential land for development 124 - London Road, Weston, Weston

Beccles Society Paul Fletcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 124 - London Road, Weston, Weston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Plot 124 should not be developed for any use under any circumstances as it takes development beyond the Relief Road and hence beyond a natural barrier to urban sprawl. The corridor adjacent to the Beccles Relief Road should only be developed for housing on a limited scale ie. not all the sites listed should be identified for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charlotte Sanderson

Section  Potential land for development 124 - London Road, Weston, Weston

Comment ID  606

Comment  Development on this site, especially of 243 houses is pushing the boundaries of Beccles further out into the countryside. The occupants of these houses will be largely reliant on using their cars, which will bring many knock on effects, for Beccles (congestion, parking and pollution).
Nicky Elliott

Section: Potential land for development 124 - London Road, Weston, Weston

Comment ID: 471

Comment:
I feel this site should not be developed, as it is to the south of the Southern Relief road which provides a natural limit to a southward creep of development from Beccles.
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Section  Potential land for development 124 - London Road, Weston, Weston

Comment ID  1210

Comment  The county council welcomes the reference to the Beccles South Relief Road and encourages the district authority to mark the route on the Beccles site map. Subject to any further assessments, the proposed level of growth around Beccles is generally acceptable with the exception of the following sites 124, 50, 71, and 77 since these are all further out from the town centre and less likely to encourage sustainable travel choices.
### Potential land for development 125 - Manor Farm Barns, Church Road, Kessingland

**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 125 - Manor Farm Barns, Church Road, Kessingland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Adjacent to Church of St Edmund grade I listed. Potential impact on setting of high grade listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kessingland Parish Council Donna Lee

Section Potential land for development 125 - Manor Farm Barns, Church Road, Kessingland

Comment ID 989

Comment With regards to site 85 (Rider Haggard Lane), site 109 (London Road) and sites 119 and 125 (Church Road) – none of the landowners came forward during the 4 years that the Neighbourhood Plan has been in progress, except the owner of sites 119 and 125 (part of these sites are being used as allotments), who stated that they didn't want to be part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. These two sites which are south of Church Road are part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) bordering the Kessingland Levels, and are not sites suitable for development.

Excluding site 41, which has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan, these 4 sites in total would bring forward 100 homes.

The Neighbourhood Plan, which is as a result of 4 years consultation with landowners and the local community brings forward 3 sites which would bring forward a total of 105 homes plus in the case of site SA1 a commercial incubator facility, in respect of site SA2 a new playing field recreation area extension and in the case of SA3 affordable homes held in perpetuity for the residents of Kessingland.

Therefore the 4 sites put forward in the Waveney Local Plan are considered to be surplus to the requirements of Kessingland, the 'Housing Needs Survey' figures are more than covered by the Neighbourhood Plan proposals, which should be included in the Waveney Local Plan in preference to the other sites put forward.
## Potential land for development 126 - Marsh Lane, Worlingham

**Robert Devine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 126 - Marsh Lane, Worlingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

I have objections due to a number of factors:

1. This site does not comply with Anglian Water's Encroachment Policy concerning the safe distance between a sewage works and any new development.

2. Anglian Water has confirmed to the Worlingham Neighbourhood Planning Group that "there is very limited capacity to accommodate growth" in the Worlingham Sewerage Treatment Works. Also "there is no investment planned to create further capacity."

3. Proposed density of housing is +50% higher than adjacent homes so would not blend in with the environment.

4. There would be an increase of at least +35% more vehicles using Marsh Lane which is very narrow and has a passing place.
Potential land for development 127 - Mill Farm Field, Somerleyton

Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council S H Read

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 127 - Mill Farm Field, Somerleyton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This site is not suitable for the proposed development as this is too large and out of scale with the rest of the village. The community has discussed various alternatives such as using less of the site and/or developing at a lower density but does not wish the site to be included in the new Local Plan. The community has also discussed the proposer’s suggestion that the site could accommodate a new community building but has noted that the landowner has not reached any agreement with the owner of the existing village hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gerda Gibbs

Section  Potential land for development 127 - Mill Farm Field, Somerleyton

Comment ID  415

Comment  This piece of land consists of two separate fields. To the west there is a strip of agricultural land bordering on to Station Road. This area may be potential for very limited building and will be discussed as part of the proposed Neighbourhood plan. Any future housing in the village must be supported by adequate infrastructure. The local bus service has been withdrawn and although there is a train station in the village with a two hourly stop, the station can only be accessed via a steep sloping narrow road with no footpath making the walk to the station extremely unsafe and difficult for children, the elderly and disabled. There is minimal employment in the village, the school is at its full capacity and the country roads are very narrow.

The second field on the eastern side of this site is a beautiful meadow filled with wildlife including nesting birds, rabbits, occasional deer and a variety of insects. There is a small pond on this field where two different species of newts have been found. This is a small piece of land supporting a large variety of fauna and flora and should not be used for further development. There is no access to this field from the main road except through a narrow unmade lane.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Potential land for development 127 - Mill Farm Field, Somerleyton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent to the Conservation Area, adjacent to Somerleyton Park Historic Parks and Gardens and proximity to Widows Cottage and The Rosery, both grade II listed. Potential impact upon Conservation Area, Historic Park and Garden and setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Douch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 127 - Mill Farm Field, Somerleyton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Not greatly desirable. Potential, but only for third to half of site, circa 10-12 houses, to include starter &amp; affordable; to include open space. Drainage problem?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Description and Development Potential
6.1 Site Option 127 (known as Mill Farm Field) is located in the centre of Somerleyton opposite Mill Farm and the bowling green, south of The Street. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 5.
6.2 Housing would most appropriately be directed to the western portion of the site which is approximately 1.5ha in size. It is generally flat and has a regular shape.
6.3 According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 45 dwellings on this part of the site. A figure of 20 to 25 (including 7 affordable homes) would be more reflective of local character.
6.4 The site is currently in agricultural use which is Grade 3. To the north is Mill Farm beyond The Street. To the east is Somerleyton Common (a small group of dwellings accessed off The Street) and to the west is residential land (Morton Peto Close, Station Road). To the south beyond a copse of trees is Waveney Grange Farm.
6.5 The site is bounded to the north by The Street and to the west by Station Road.
Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal
6.6 The site sustainability appraisal (SSA) at Point 1 states that "no community facilities propose". We disagree with this assessment. The drawing E374/CFS2 submitted with our call for sites submission clearly shows potential amenity land at the front of the site and a potential beneficial relationship with Site Option 127 where community facilities are a possibility, as discussed in the written part of our call for sites submission. Suggest the effect here should be raised to ++ effect.
6.7 At Point 4 the SSA states "limited community facilities located in the village". This is incorrect. The Waveney village profile or Somerleyton confirms that there is a full suite of key facilities and this needs to be recognised. Suggest the effect should be increased to ++.
6.8 At Point 9 the SSA scores -. And this in part because it is a "significant sized site relative to the size of the village". However please review drawing E374/CFS2 submitted with our call for sites submission as that shows the potential subdivision of the site and a smaller area than the Council are
assuming for the residential element.
### Somerleyton Estate Lord Somerleyton
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 127 - Mill Farm Field, Somerleyton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1 We are pleased the Local Planning Authority has assessed these sites in combination as this reflects our submissions to the Call for Sites consultation.

8.2 At Point 9 in the site sustainability appraisal (SSA) the comments are generally positive with only a single negative comment and yet the topic scores - because it is a "significant sized site relative to the size of the village". However please review drawings E374/CFS2 & 3 submitted with our call for sites submission as they show the potential subdivision of the site and a smaller area than the Council are assuming for the residential element.

8.3 We look forward to discussing these possibilities further as the process moves forwards.
Potential land for development 128 - Mill Farm, Somerleyton

ann hutchinson

Section  Potential land for development 128 - Mill Farm, Somerleyton

Comment ID  513

Comment  Mill Farm is in the middle of Somerleyton which adds to the rural character of the village. I have heard tourists comment on this with appreciation.
Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council S H Read

Section Potential land for development 128 - Mill Farm, Somerleyton

Comment ID 699

Comment This site is not suitable for inclusion in the new Local Plan because it is a working farm held on a lifetime tenancy by the farmer, who reports he does not intend to leave.
I would like to comment on the proposed land for development at Mill Farm, Somerleyton (Site No. 128). As the tenant of the farm I would like to provide Waveney District Council with detailed information on the current use of the site as well as my observations about the proposal.

1. Current Use of the Site/Buildings

Drawings prepared by Paul Robinson Partnership appear to show my home (Mill Farmhouse) as a redundant building. This building is not redundant and was extensively refurbished in 2014 and is occupied by myself all year round.

The farm buildings earmarked for a material change of use are an integral part of my beef production facility and are used throughout the year. There is a clear market with consumers for local, quality beef and my successful business model is based on traditional farming methods out of Mill Farm and can be supported by a number of year’s financial accounts, if required.

2. Agricultural Tenancy Agreement

I am the second generation of a three generation full agricultural tenancy.

3. Conservation Area

Somerleyton has been designated as being an area of special architectural or historical interest, which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. Mill Farm is referred to many times within the Somerleyton Conservation Area – Character Appraisal (Waveney District Council Design & Conservation Team (2011) Somerleyton Conservation Area – Character Appraisal). The document states "Included within the conservation area are the historic cores of two working farms, White House Farm, and Mill Farm. Despite the introduction of modern buildings their historic farmyards remain clearly discernible."

My Grandfather and Father before me have lived at Mill Farm and it is understood that a group of farm buildings appears on this site on the 1844 tithe map1. Mill Farm has been an operational farm for many generations and is fundamentally part of the character of the area. The material change of use of fully utilised farm buildings to residential would appear to result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

4. Adverse Impact on Residential Amenity

I consider myself to be a sensitive farmer and endeavour to reduce any
adverse impact on my existing near neighbours and enjoy good relationships with local residents. However, the drawings prepared by Paul Robinson Partnership show the proposed dwellings within a few metres of a full operational farm with a shared access. As a large beef producer (a herd of over 200 head) activities can take place during the daytime and night-time periods. This may include vehicle movements (tractors and HGV deliveries of feed) as well as animal husbandry.

In my opinion, there is no realistic method of satisfactorily mitigating the impact of noise and disturbance at the new dwellings given such close proximity. To put this into context, new large scale livestock buildings would not be permitted in such close proximity to existing dwellings. I would be grateful if you could please take my comments into consideration when looking at the proposed residential development of Mill Farm.
Gerda Gibbs

Section  Potential land for development 128 - Mill Farm, Somerleyton

Comment ID  412

Comment  This Farm land has been part of the village for many, many years and contributes strongly to the character and uniqueness of Somerleyton village. To walk past on a lovely summers day watching the cows in the meadow and hearing the song thrushes sing in the farmland trees is a lovely experience. It is not suitable for development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 128 - Mill Farm, Somerleyton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Located within the Conservation Area and proximity to Widows Cottage, grade II listed. Potential impact upon Conservation Area and setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Julie Reynolds</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 128 - Mill Farm, Somerleyton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>There is a farm on this site, would not like to see it leave the village, do not believe it is necessary to develop the only working farm left in such a good location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Douch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 128 - Mill Farm, Somerleyton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>While the farm is viable, not desirable. Potential for 8-12 houses, incl starter &amp; affordable; to include open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID 1178

Comment Site Description and Development Potential

5.1 Site Option 128 (known locally as Mill Farm) is located in the centre of Somerleyton adjacent to the bowling green. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 4.

5.2 It is a regular square shape with existing agricultural buildings and a pond to the front. The site is generally flat and level with a slight rise in the land to the north.

5.3 The site is 1.2ha in size and is well related to the built form of the village. It occupies a central position within the Somerleyton Conservation Area. None of the agricultural buildings are listed.

5.4 It is expected that the existing buildings would remain and form part of any future development. There is approximately 0.7 ha to the rear of the site unencumbered by buildings. According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 21 dwellings on this part of the site.

5.5 More appropriately and reflecting the density of surrounding development this part of the site could provide for 15 dwellings (including 5 affordable homes) arranged in a manner sympathetic to the form and position of the farmyard within the village.

5.6 To the north of the site is agricultural land extending some 400m to the B1074 St Olaves Road. To the east is residential land and to the west the bowling green and further residential land. To the south is The Street, Morton Peto Close to the southwest and Mill Farm Field to the southeast.

5.7 In the south of the site is Mill Farm pond again described in the Somerleyton Conservation Area Character Appraisal (SCACA) for its contribution to the character of the area.

5.8 The site has a significant frontage onto The Street and an existing access with good visibility in each direction.

Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal

5.9 The site sustainability appraisal (SSA) at Point 1 states that "no community facilities propose". We disagree with this assessment. The drawing E374/CFS1 submitted with our call for sites submission clearly shows potential amenity land at the front of the site and a potential beneficial relationship with Site Option 127 where community facilities are
a possibility. Suggest the effect here should be raised to ++ effect.

5.10 At Point 4 the SSA states "limited community facilities located in the village". This is incorrect. The Waveney village profile or Somerleyton confirms that there is a full suite of key facilities and this needs to be recognised. Suggest the effect should be increased to ++.

5.11 At Point 13 the SSA states that there are several listed buildings on site and the resultant score is --. This is incorrect. The buildings on site are local list and not statutorily listed and they are outside of the potential land for housing as shown on drawing E374/CFS1 submitted with our call for sites submission. This score should be improved to '0' (neutral).

5.12 In terms of the current use of the Mill Farm site for agriculture we understand from our clients the land owners that arrangements have been put in place to move the tenant to more modern buildings locally.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>294</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Suggest that this is planted as a woodland area to make wildlife habitation. The village of Blundeston will become Carlton Colville if further development is permitted. Just take a drive down The Street in Blundeston along the obstacle course and mish mash of parked cars and current overdevelopment. On the plan so far no account is taken of any future development of the former prison site and the impact this could have. Blundeston is a village – keep it that way. This is simply greed and over development. We strongly object.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

**andy Howlett**
Anthony Light

Section | Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID | 944

Comment | Site 129 has previously been refused planning permission.
Bruce Rayner

Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 399

Site 129

Plan indicates that housing demand may exceed supply and that there may be a requirement for a further 8,000 homes before 2036. Before large areas of the locality are built upon, are the Council certain of the requirement? It would seem irresponsible to build numerous 'white elephants'. Is this not merely a function of the Government's policy to build a specified number of homes but without certainty of need in this area?

The plan indicates that there are already 3,141 new homes in the pipeline plus a further 633 anticipated. That would seem to be enough for the present until precise requirements are known.

Comments are:

a) Most employment is South of the river. Blundeston is to the North.
b) Transport in Blundeston is poor, there is bad road access and it is dangerous even with low traffic. Sites 164-165 are better served.
c) Site does not benefit from obvious safe and easy access.
d) Why spoil such a beautiful area, enjoyed by tourists, local runners and cyclists? Further traffic would be a hazard.
e) As a Chartered Surveyor, your numbers per hectare do not appear to be accurate.
f) There are no amenities in Blundeston, not even a village shop for milk, bread, etc.
g) There is no regular bus service. Increased traffic to get in and out of the village is an environmental issue. Areas identified South of Lowestoft are already served by public transport and allocated safe cycle routes.
h) Properties in Blundeston are mature. New homes next to what are already new homes in Carlton Colville would be much better.
i) By publishing this document, you seem to have added planning blight to nearly all of the homes surrounding Lowestoft for no apparent reason.
j) Building 456 new homes in Blundeston would almost double the population of the village, surely not desirable, sensible or necessary.
k) Current essential services /supply are limited. At certain times of the day, water pressure is already very low.
l) Risk of flooding through rainfall if a concrete jungle is built - sewers can't cope.
m) Broadband is slow and mobile phone signal is bad.
n) Development on the prison site is already ample for the village to cope with.
o) Blundeston is inhabited by lots of wildlife. There are owls, newts, hedgehogs, etc. I’ve heard baby owls calling to their parents from our house. Some of these species are becoming rare. Why destroy these areas when there are alternatives? It makes far more sense to build on the sites identified in Carlton Colville. The proper infrastructure could be put in place in one designated area. Why spoil beautiful landscapes, upset huge numbers of the local population and potentially decrease tourism and enjoyment of the areas outlined.
Gary Shilling

Section Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 381

Comment As outlined in my local village newsletter (Blundeston) I would like to register my rejection to any large scale building (sites 29, 42, 63 & 129), in my opinion the village neither has nor has the ability to enable a construction on these scales. We have neither the roads to handle the increased traffic (roads not in a good state of repair or wide enough, concerns for children around the village as no road has a cycle lane or footpath), the school could not accommodate an increase, no local facilities and simply no need. It is nice to remain a village and not end up becoming part of oil ton broad as outlined village has done! I have no objection to small (under 10) development that allow the village to absorb the impact that it would have. I understand this is a biased view, but like everybody whom lives here, we picked it because it is a small village. This is mind with the development on the old prison site and other sites (that have been constructed and are just footings in the ground) the usual infill sites have been enough. The development on the prison will increase the traffic in and out of the village hugely as most households have two cars if not more, and that with children staying at home for longer traffic will increase without further building. T can already be seen throughout Lowestoft, Blundeston aside people are increasing parking on the road instead of using garages of changing front gardens to off road parking which should be implemented to remove cars parked on roads to increase road safety. Sorry didn’t mean to turn into a rant.
Gary Shilling

Section Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 582

Comment Not suitable as village infrastructure not capable of sustain a development of this size, i.e drainage (already an unsolved problem), roads (too narrow and un paved for pedestrians),
Section: Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID: 281

Comment: This development is unwanted by many local residents and with the old prison site earmarked for re-development it's just a case of too much in a small area. The sewage system doesn't seem to be able to cope with the amount of houses that are already here, and the road network around Blundeston is not sufficient to carry the additional vehicles given that most households have 2 cars. Also on a personal note we moved to a village to get away from an over populated town and feel that further development will cause Blundeston to lose its charm and appeal.
John Mitchell

Section
Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID
651

Comment
Site 129 for 45 houses could use the existing road access on the corner of Market Lane. But, it seems a shame to extend housing into the open countryside around the village, when a suitable brownfield site already exists in the village.
Laura Gooding

Section  Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 384

Comment  The Pippins is a road which will be backed onto by site 129 where they want 45 houses. Our garden gets flooded in the winter as the drainage is so bad due to old sewage systems which simply can not Handle all the drainage currently. If more houses are built on the back field this will cause damage to our gardens.
Lisa Doylend

Section Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 894

Comment With comment to the option of sites that housing has been proposed for in our village, I seriously think that our small village roads cannot cope with the extra volume of traffic. Sites 42, 27, 129, 29 should definitely be ruled out.
Lisa Doylend

**Section**

Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

**Comment ID**

897

**Comment**

Sites 27, 129, 49, same main reason of extra traffic as sites mentioned above. Sites 20 and 63 are better situated with access from Flixton Road, which would keep extra vehicles away from village, but still too many houses proposed for sites, these could potentially create an extra 600 vehicles on small roads.
Atkinson

Section Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 670

Comment I wish to object to the development of site 129 on the grounds of limited access via Pickwick Drive. Pickwick Drive is accessed from Market Lane via a very sharp, blind bend. This would not be safe for construction vehicles accessing the site or for future residential traffic accessing the site. In addition Market Lane has suffered from flooding in recent years because the drainage system is unable to cope with the demands placed on it.
Tim caley

Section Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 298

Comment This is green belt land.
Blundeston has a huge pending development site at the prison site. There is no infrastructure in the village to support the present expansion let alone more building. Blundeston has no shops, doctors surgery or dentist and has a school which is already oversubscribed.
All local roads are small and dangerous with numerous blind bends and hidden entrances and exits. Further increases in traffic will increase deaths and or serious injuries. Roads are in an appalling state of repair and are constantly clogged with school traffic.
Rosalind Roots

Section | Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID | 884

Comment | Sites 129 and 27 are close to fields and hedges where wildlife would be threatened. We are presently blessed with an abundance of wildlife, that I have recently been able to photograph, like hares, rare butterflies, deer, and varieties of birds including species on the decline like skylarks and cuckoo. It is a peaceful area enjoyed by the villagers and it is hoped that these sites will not be chosen.
Suffolk County Council James Cutting

Section  
Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID 1208

Comment  
The large sites around Blundeston (63, 42, 129) are not currently desirable as there are limited amenities and services within reasonable distance to promote sustainable travel patterns and some of the road network might not be of sufficient standard or capacity. If this scale of development, including growth beyond the village and the proposed redevelopment of the prison, is to be brought forward, a comprehensive review of transport issues will need to be undertaken which may include opportunities for further enhancement of transport infrastructure and services.
**Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Based on aerial photographs, sites 54; 84; and 129 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terry Gooding

Section: Potential land for development 129 - Old horticultural nursery to the north of Oakleigh, Market Lane, Blundeston

Comment ID: 348

Comment: Blundeston cannot support a development of this size, there simply isn't the infrastructure to justify it. Destruction of greenfield sites, over subscription of essential services such as schools and doctors, the fact that roads will become busier and more dangerous as a result. Increased risks of flooding due to concrete coverage.

As a wider concern I do not see plans for new hospitals, fire stations, police stations, doctors, school or public transport

Why is the redevelopment of the prison site not included here which in itself will contain at least 100 houses - will this offset your need to build all over Blundeston & ruin yet another beautiful village. People live here to escape the sprawl not live on a housing estate.

I appreciate that housing is required but not on this scale and any planning application of this nature will be opposed by all who live there.
Potential land for development 130 - Old Rectory Poultry Unit, Benacre Road, Henstead With Hulver Street

Henstead with Hulver Street Parish Council John Armstrong

Section Potential land for development 130 - Old Rectory Poultry Unit, Benacre Road, Henstead With Hulver Street

Comment ID 1235

Comment The Parish Council considered the questions you asked it to provide information about. They agreed that the proposed sites for possible development were unsuitable in terms of the number of houses projected for the sites. As I explained in my previous response the Councillors did not feel that they could respond to the other questions about jobs and facilities until after the consultations with residents in the development of the neighbourhood plan.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section: Potential land for development 130 - Old Rectory Poultry Unit, Benacre Road, Henstead With Hulver Street

Comment ID: 1078

Comment: Old Rectory grade II 150 metres to east. Potential impact on setting of Listed Building.
**Julie Reynolds**

**Section** | Potential land for development 130 - Old Rectory Poultry Unit, Benacre Road, Henstead With Hulver Street
---|---
**Comment ID** | 190
**Comment** | Good area to develop, well centred in the village with good access and pleasant views. Would link well with existing housing.
Moore

Section  Potential land for development 130 - Old Rectory Poultry Unit, Benacre Road, Henstead With Hulver Street

Comment ID  509

Comment  We feel the potential building of 57 homes (a mini Housing Estate) on this rural field would be a massive over-development. Henstead with Hulver Street is a small countryside village with no facilities. There are no public buses through the village so all journeys would have to be taken by car to Beccles, Lowestoft or Norwich for shopping, leisure, medical services etc. 57 homes could easily involve a hundred vehicles and access onto the busy B1127 would cause a lot of problems. There are no doctors, schools, pubs in the area, not even a village shop. There is nothing (not even a safe play area) for young children, no pub or entertainment or centre for elderly people. The visual appearance of a housing estate would ruin the quiet countryside area and be totally out of keeping with the surroundings. We therefore strongly oppose this as a suitable site for multiple housing.
## Potential land for development 131 - Orchard Farm Rear Field, New Road, Mutford

**Charlotte Sanderson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 131 - Orchard Farm Rear Field, New Road, Mutford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | I feel that this development would be inappropriate for a number of reasons:  
* This is currently a Greenfield site.  
* It is outside the village envelope.  
* The development of 42 homes would change the very rural nature of this end of the village, and would lead to the suburbanisation of the area.  
* I feel that this development would set an unacceptable precedent.  
* 42 homes would place pressure on the struggling existing sewage infrastructure.  
* Neither Mutford nor Barnby / North Cove has no village shop, few places of employment, and no surgery. The village school at Barnby is full.  
* The occupants of the new development would be reliant on their car, which is not sustainable. It is my view that this development is likely to add a further 84 cars regularly joining the A146 (and add a likely 212 extra vehicle movements a day). There would be greater likelihood of collisions, and increased levels of air pollution.  
* The New Road and surrounding lanes are used for recreational purposes and are popular with cyclists, horse riders and walkers.  
* The "soundscape" of this part of the village is likely to change in character. Other than the noise of the A146, it is quite quiet. You can hear farm animals and wildlife. This is an important feature of the villages "breathing space". It is likely that a suburban housing development would add lawnmowers, radios and voices, and so change peoples experience on the nearby public footpath.  
* The rural character of the night sky would change, with the addition of security lights and potentially street lights. |
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  
Potential land for development 131 - Orchard Farm Rear Field, New Road, Mutford

Comment ID  
1079

Comment  
Proximity to grade II Ash Farmhouse to the east. Potential impact on setting of Listed Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 131 - Orchard Farm Rear Field, New Road, Mutford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>At their last meeting the Council also agreed that the proposed sites were totally unsuitable for development. Site 131 is a greenfield site, site 88 is also a greenfield site and would extend the curtilage of the Village and also impact on two grade 2 listed buildings. Council is also undertaking a neighbourhood plan and wish to wait until the outcome of the consultation process is known before responding to the other questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robert Gill

Section  Potential land for development 131 - Orchard Farm Rear Field, New Road, Mutford

Comment ID  238

Comment  This site (together with site 132) is the middle of open farmland, and is situated up a very narrow lane, with a dangerous junction onto a fast moving and busy road. Building here is not necessary in order to meet the housing demand. We oppose the inclusion of the site.
Potential land for development 132 - Orchard Farm, New Road, Barnby

Barnby Parish Council Ian Hinton

Section Potential land for development 132 - Orchard Farm, New Road, Barnby

Comment ID 669

Comment So called "Orchard Farm" (including 131 in Mutford) although away from the village, it has been the subject of many applications for residential, aborted farming functions, then holiday lets. It now has a new feed shed being built that would be sufficient for a 100-acre farm rather than a 10-acre field – currently allegedly farmland.
**Charlotte Sanderson**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 132 - Orchard Farm, New Road, Barnby

**Comment ID**  
597

**Comment**  
I feel that this development would be inappropriate for a number of reasons:
* This is currently a Greenfield site.
* It is outside the village envelope.
* The development of 40 homes would change the very rural nature of this end of the village, and would lead to the suburbanisation of the area.
* I feel that this development would set an unacceptable precedent.
* 40 homes would place pressure on the struggling existing sewage infrastructure.
* Barnby has no village shop, few places of employment, and no surgery. The school is full.
* The occupants of the new development would be reliant on their car, which is not sustainable. It is my view that this development is likely to add a further 80 cars regularly joining the A146 (and add a likely 200 extra vehicle movements a day). There would be greater likelihood of collisions, and increased levels of air pollution.
* The "soundscape" of this part of the village is likely to change in character. Other than the noise of the A146, it is quite quiet. You can hear farm animals and wildlife. This is an important feature of the villages "breathing space”. It is likely that a suburban housing development would add lawnmowers, radios and voices, and so change peoples experience on the nearby public footpath.
* The rural character of the night sky would change, with the addition of security lights and potentially street lights.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic England Debbie Mack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robert Gill

Section Potential land for development 132 - Orchard Farm, New Road, Barnby

Comment ID 239

Comment This site, together with site 131, is situated in the middle of open farmland and along a very narrow lane. The access from the lane is onto a fast moving and busy main road. This site is not required in order to meet housing need and will detract from the rural environment. We oppose the inclusion of the site.
Potential land for development 133 - Owls Cottage, Marsh Lane, Worlingham

Robert Devine

Section Potential land for development 133 - Owls Cottage, Marsh Lane, Worlingham

Comment ID 50

Comment I have objections due to a number of factors:
1. The proposed site does not comply with Anglian Water’s Encroachment Policy concerning the safe distance between a sewage works and any new development.
2. Anglian Water has confirmed to the Worlingham Neighbourhood Planning Group that "there is very limited capacity to accommodate growth" in the Worlinghan Sewerage Treatment Works. Also "there is no investment planned to create further capacity."
3. The proposed density of housing is +50% higher than adjacent homes so would not blend in with the environment.
4. There would be an increase of at least +45% more vehicles using Marsh Lane which is narrow and has a passing place.
Potential land for development 134 - Playing Field, off A145 London Road, Shadingfield

Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section
Potential land for development 134 - Playing Field, off A145 London Road, Shadingfield

Comment ID
852

Comment
Group of sites to the south of Beccles – As they are on rising ground, any development proposals would need to be assessed for potential landscape and visual impacts on the Broads area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 134 - Playing Field, off A145 London Road, Shadingfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Close to Fox Farmhouse, grade II listed building to north. Potential impact on setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Lavery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 134 - Playing Field, off A145 London Road, Shadingfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>This also applies to plots 68,59,64,94. Any and all of these possible developments are going to change the Village dramatically. Shadingfield is a very pleasant Village to live in provided you have a car and are in good health. Without big changes to infrastructure these developments wouldn’t be viable. With the necessary changes Shadingfield becomes a suburb of Beccles and loses its character forever. I am therefore firmly against these suggestions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sotterley Estate Tom Barne  
Evolution Town Planning LLP (Steven Bainbridge)

Section  
Potential land for development 134 - Playing Field, off A145 London Road, Shadingfield

Comment ID  
1187

Comment  
Site Description and Development Potential
4.1 Site Option 134 is the Playing Field and is located in the centre of Willingham. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 4.
4.2 It is accepted that replacement provision of the existing facilities would need to occur to allow for development of this site i.e. the playing field and play equipment would need to be replaced/relocated. The Sotterley Estate own adjoining land so this is not a constraint to delivery. Indeed, improvements such as dedicated parking and improved facilities including road safety features on the main road could be considered.
4.3 The site is 1.2ha in size and is well related to the built form of the village. It is a regular square shape with a pair of goal posts and some play equipment in one corner. According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 36 dwellings on this part of the site.
4.4 More appropriately and reflecting the density of surrounding development this site could provide for around 20 dwellings (including 6 affordable homes) arranged in a manner sympathetic to the site and its location. This could also include a route through to a new playing field site (as identified on the map in Appendix 4) with parking provision which does not currently exist.
4.5 The site is bounded on all sides by residential development and adjoins an agricultural field to the northeast which could provide for the replacement playing field. The site has a significant frontage onto London Rd which is in a 30mph zone and an existing access with good visibility in each direction.

Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal
4.6 The Site Sustainability Assessment (SSA) for this site at Point 1 states that there would be a significant loss of an open space and football pitch. This is not what is proposed; the Estate do not expect to be able to develop the site in whole or in part without replacing that provision.
4.7 The assessment for Site Option 134 in combination with Site Option 68 is the correct assessment based on the submissions we made to the Call for Sites consultation.
4.8 The combined assessment for Options 134 and 68 notes the potential loss of a village focal point. We agree that the retention of some open space on the frontage with London Road, combined with improved pedestrian facilities would mitigate this loss.
Potential land for development 135 - Playing Field, Somerleyton

Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council S H Read

Section  Potential land for development 135 - Playing Field, Somerleyton

Comment ID  700

Comment  This site is not suitable for housing development as this would breach national planning guidance, it would result in the loss of a vibrant playing field which is used for league cricket and is one of very few publicly accessible large grass areas in the parishes and that the indicative number of houses would create traffic problems in Station Road. The site indicated is mainly held on a long lease by Somerleyton Community Association, which also owns a small part of the site. The proposer has not reached any agreement with Somerleyton Community Association for any use of this site except as a playing field.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chris Morris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gerda Gibbs

Section Potential land for development 135 - Playing Field, Somerleyton

Comment ID 413

Comment The playing field is a well used green area for all sort of recreational purposes. It is the home grounds for Blundeston and Somerleyton Cricket club participating in County matches. In addition the club has a children/young people cricket group attached. The tennis courts are used twice weekly by the local tennis club and by individual tennis players. The play equipment on the enclosed play area is used by many small children especially while the grow-ups are playing sports. Families fly kites and play ball games on the field, people enjoy walking across the grass and the surrounding hedges are filled with a variety of wildlife. Temporary accommodation has been placed on the field - the clubs and the village are hoping that these will be replaced by a sport/village hall when funding becomes available. This invaluable recreational land is NOT suitable for housing development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th>Potential land for development 135 - Playing Field, Somerleyton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent to Conservation Area and proximity to White House, Pond Cottages and Widows Cottage, all grade II listed to north. Potential impact on setting of listed buildings and conservation area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joy Jones

Section  Potential land for development 135 - Playing Field, Somerleyton

Comment ID  566

Comment  Building on this site would greatly increase the volume of traffic through the village. The playing field is a valuable resource for villagers to use. I can’t think of any alternative and accessible area, within easy reach for villagers, that could resite the playing field and have space for cricket pitch, a play area, tennis court etc. Therefore it is very important that the playing field remains where it is now.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julie Reynolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul Douch

Section  Potential land for development 135 - Playing Field, Somerleyton

Comment ID  452

Comment  Undesirable: this land should be protected as "Local Green Space"
Site Description and Development Potential

7.1 Site Option 135 (playing field) is located in the south of the village off Station Road. A plan of the site is included in Appendix 6. The Site edged red on the enclosed plan is approximately 3.2ha in size and incorporates space for a cricket pitch and football pitch, a children's play area and a multiuse games area (MUGA). It is clearly understood that any loss of sport and play space provision would need to be compensated for and that the precise details of this would be a matter of detail for a later stage in this process and/or a planning application.

7.2 The suggested development area could be less at approximately 1.6ha and this would be dependent on the degree of retention of existing playing field and play space facilities which may be surplus to requirements or replaced locally. The Estate are currently investigating whether there is majority support in the community for a proposal like this hence the nature of this particular site submission proposing to link to the adjacent site to provide offset facilities. According to Policy DM16 a density of 30dph would indicate a minimum of 48 dwellings on this part of the site. We consider a figure of 20 to 25 (including 7 affordable homes) would be more reflective of local character.

7.3 To the north of the site is residential land associated with the properties fronting Station Road, Morton Peto Close and properties fronting The Street. To the southeast is Waveney Grange Farm, and to the east and south is agricultural land beyond Station Road. To the west is woodland.

Response to Issues and Options Consultation and Site Sustainability Appraisal

7.4 The site sustainability appraisal (SSA) at Point 1 refers to "limited community facilities in the village". This is incorrect. The Waveney village profile or Somerleyton confirms that there is a full suite of key facilities and this needs to be recognised.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 136 - Rear of 11, 15, 17, 19 &amp; 21 Birds Lane, Lowestoft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Re: Development of small plot on land at rear of Birds Lane in Lowestoft. I have recently taken the time to read a lot about the future growth for Waveney. I have lived in Lowestoft all my life I have formed an opinion on where housing should be developed based on my lifetime of living here. I feel that yes we will need large areas of growth on the outskirts of town. People naturally will want to move to the suburbs when they start a family or grow their family. However, and this is reference to this and one other site i can see on the map for potential land for development [137]. I think that we do have lots of land or indeed disused buildings in the central areas of towns, places near schools and shops - where i feel should be immediate and top priority for development. Why do i think this? Well if we continue to just expand the housing on the outskirts of town then we are just causing a traffic problem. If you are on the outskirts of town you are going to need cars to be getting in and around town. If we develop in town then this will reduce the traffic problems and indeed encourage healthy transport such as walking and cycling. People want to live near schools, shops, parks, the beach etc so to keep mindlessly expanding on more green space, lets have a look around and develop the many small scale areas where homes are going to be close and convenient to amenities which people need. I know NIMBY’s will say we dont want development near my house, and this will occur if developing in urban areas, however we can’t leave prime space or horrible looking disused buildings where families could be living just because people don’t want houses built there. I see the flood deference is being consulted on and i’m sure once this is built it will free up a lot of land which currently maybe in a supposed once every few hundred year flood zone. Again i hope this opens up more urban area for development so that we can stop the sprawl and start to live in...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
town and reduce the need to use a car and block up the roads. So in my opinion smaller sites like 136, which are actually in the town of Lowestoft should be developed as a priority.
Potential land for development 137 - Rear of Nos 485 & 487 London Road South, Lowestoft

Adam Skinner

Section  Potential land for development 137 - Rear of Nos 485 & 487 London Road South, Lowestoft

Comment ID  224

Comment  I feel this should be left in its current use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 137 - Rear of Nos 485 &amp; 487 London Road South, Lowestoft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Adjacent to Conservation Area. Two Chapels and Lychgate at Kirkley Cemetery, all grade II listed. Potential impact on setting of Listed buildings and Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having read a lot about the future growth for Waveney and having lived in Lowestoft all my life I have formed an opinion on where housing should be developed. I feel that yes we will need large areas of growth on the outskirts of town. People naturally will want to move to the suburbs when they start a family or grow their family. However, and this is reference to this and one other site I can see on the map for potential land for development. I feel that we do have lots of land or indeed disused buildings in the central areas of towns, places near schools and shops - where I feel should be immediate and top priority for development.

Why? Well if we continue to just expand the housing on the outskirts of town then we are just causing a traffic problem. If you are on the outskirts of town you are going to need cars to be getting in and around town. If we develop in town then this will reduce the traffic problems and indeed encourage healthy transport such as walking and cycling. People want to live near schools, shops, parks, the beach etc so to keep mindlessly expanding on more green space, let's have a look around and develop the many small scale areas where homes are going to be close and convenient to amenities which people need.

I know NIMBY's will say we don't want development near my house, and this will occur if developing in urban areas, however we can't leave prime space or horrible looking disused buildings where families could be living just because people don't want houses built there.

I see the flood deference is being consulted on and I'm sure once this is built it will free up a lot of land which currently maybe in a supposed once every few hundred year flood zone. Again I hope this opens up more urban area for development so that we can stop the sprawl and start to live in town and reduce the need to use a car and block up the roads.

Get building 'in' Lowestoft. That's my opinion Anyway.
Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

AP and AE Wolton

Section  
Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  
941

Comment  
On no account should the St. Felix playing field site still be considered when there are already other sites - both within and outside the village boundary. The Government’s view on health, fitness and the war on obesity should immediately reflect this application. We understand, already many objections have already been submitted to you including national Sports Council etc.
David Salter

Section  Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  440

Comment  I am a resident of St Georges Square but I don't look over the proposed development (so not a NIMBY)
I appose this development on the following grounds:
* The infill on green and field sites (in this case AONB) will destroy the look and feel of Reydon
* The development will drag in more holiday/second home owners
* Reydon will become so big that we will need to develop a shopping centre to support the people
* Does this now fit into a plan to make Reydon a town and is that what the people of Reydon want
* I don't feel there is a need for more housing and if the UK pulls out of the EU, the country may be awash with unused housing
* This is a serious decision that could spoil the very special position Reydon holds
* Please listen to what the people want
des o'callaghan

Section  Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  642

Comment  I do not think the St Felix Reydon site is suitable. It is an AONB, part of and adjacent to fauna and flora reserves of great importance. Moreover I do not think the current infrastructure supports the existing developments e.g water and sewage.

As asides, the school plan seems not to have been thought out properly with a reason for wanting monies to defray operating costs. This is only postponing the demise of the school if true. Also, the number of houses applied for (70) is ridiculous given the plot size.
G D Humphries

Section | Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID | 889

Comment | As I have lived in Reydon for a great number of years I have seen the village grow in size, and if not careful the village atmosphere would change. As for the proposed site near Keens Lane a most dangerous road to come out onto the Halesworth Road at any time of year. It would mean more cars on the already stretched roads. Also like all developments second homes for people outside of the area. Too many houses mean over development, and ruin the atmosphere of such a lovely area. One can see what happened to our neighbours in Southwold as a victim of its own success. Nearly all second houses priced out of young people's reach. Parking in the summer time is hopeless. Shops trying to find people to work in them. Even the prices of Reydon property is going up and up as people struggle to afford Southwold prices, and even Reydon now has many holiday homes. It must retain the countryside aspect, without becoming a concrete jungle.

As for building on St. Felix School playing fields that should be removed completely from consideration. It would spoil the whole outlook. Enough houses were built when St. George's Square was built. Enough is enough otherwise there is no end to development in the area. As there is very little work apart from seasonal and retail it means more second homes which is ridiculous. More homes more traffic it is bad enough now. It would be a great shame to see the playing field built on, and lose more of the countryside that makes Reydon a village atmosphere. There is no industry here and prices are so high most of the young people move away, and you need a mixture of both young and old.

Do we need anymore development the answer is no. If we keep building at this rate all the villages will be joined up. Also with trees and countryside we have the pleasure of wildlife. Owls, bats and birds, and more.
G Golding

Section Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID 90

Comment Site 138 has had objections from all these professional bodies
Sport England
Natural England
Suffolk Coast and Heaths
Suffolk Wildlife Trust
Suffolk Preservation Society
Suffolk Archaeology
Suffolk Highways Department
circa 100 local objections have been logged on the Waveney planning website, this site borders a Natura2000 site, which is protected under EU law, this is simply not the place to develop. Reydon and Southwold has already sufficient land stock to meet the needs of local demand.
Development along the approach to Southwold is of significant importance to attracting visitors into the area, so to is safe guarding our AONB and wildlife environment.
Any additional access point onto the Halesworth Road for a significant number of vehicles will cause many problems on what is an already busy and dangerous road,
The gateway into Southwold is a recognised attribute to Southwold and this extends along the entire road leading into Southwold from Reydon and the A12. In 2006, a previous planning application was turned down by the Planning Inspectorate who ruled that development on this site would damage the natural line of trees
Mr A S Newman for and on behalf of the Secretary of State, wrote
"This double line of Holm Oaks ..is a feature of high amenity value on the main road approach to Reydon and Southwold."
"In my opinion the construction of this access would have a harmful visual impact on the group value of TPO trees and their contribution to the approach to Reydon."
**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Gorse Lodge Farmhouse Grade II to north. Potential impact on setting of Listed Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jim Elmes

Section  
Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  
162

Comment  
Access onto Halesworth Road may be difficult. With the fall of this land to the south, how will drainage be dealt with?
John and Barbara Carter

Section  Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  787

Comment  Wherever possible it is important that new homes are built on brown field sites and that village boundaries are not extended. We strongly believe that allowing the St Felix playing field site to be developed would be detrimental to this AONB and it would set a precedent for the approval of future applications for other parts of St Felix and adjacent areas.

At peak periods (especially in summer time) the A1095 (Halesworth Road) is heavily trafficked and often access from connecting roads is delayed. Any future development of this area would seriously impact on this traffic problem.
I wish to strongly object to any proposal to build on the St. Felix School Playing Fields by St.Georges Square (referred to as Site 138 on the Waveney Map). My objections cover firstly the entire proposal and secondly, to the development of land west of St. George's Lane, directly behind St. George's Square.

Objections to the Entire Application:

The land on which the application DC/15/3288/OUT proposes to build 71 houses is of unique character and gives to the environs of Reydon and Southwold a quality that makes the area so attractive to all those who visit this part of Suffolk. This land, although used as school playing fields, forms a natural division between the buildings of St. Felix School and the row of houses along the Halesworth Rd. that continue all the way into Southwold. This natural break between these two entities is enhanced by the beauty of the unbroken line of trees that separate the land from the Halesworth Road. The application, if it succeeded, would result in this natural green space disappearing and result in a mishmash of building/housing developments stretching from St. Felix School to Southwold, which would present to any visitor to the town a dreary and depressing backdrop as they came along the Halesworth Rd.

The location of the access road shown on the development plans is at the worst position possible. It is very close to three other road entrances near to Keens Lane, which are all near to a bend and a dip in the road. The proposed location of the entrance would make this stretch of the Halesworth Rd. very dangerous. Drivers coming out of this entrance would have great difficulty getting on to the Halesworth Rd. at peak times and drivers exiting from other entrances would be exposed to greater hazards than they experience already.

The land should remain as playing fields, either for the school or for use by the local community. Presently the playing fields are heavily used by the Southwold Rugby Club for practices. Other uses could be made by local football and cricket clubs.

Before the plan is even considered by the planning inspectors, it is vital that the viability of St. Felix School in the long term is considered. St. Felix School used to own a considerable amount of land in the Reydon/Southwold
district that has gradually been sold off over the years in order to finance the school.

Objections to development of land west of St. George's Lane, directly behind St. George's Square:

The land to the west of St. George's lane is part of the wooded area that forms the eastern escarpment of the sunken track (Shepherds' Lane) which runs down from the Halesworth Rd. to the Marsh Cottages. This area is of unique beauty and character and is situated mostly in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as defined on the maps. Unfortunately, there is a small level patch of land between this area and St. George's Square on the west side of St. George's Lane on which the plans submitted with the application DC/15/3288/OUT show the placement of two houses. Building two houses in this location would represent a serious intrusion into a beautiful area of wooded country. Furthermore, their close proximity to the residences of St. George’s Square would affect the aspect that many of the residents enjoy looking to the south and south-west as well as reducing some of their natural light.

The original plans prepared by St. Felix School's agent, Bidwells, did not show these two houses on the west of St. George's Lane. In order to preserve this unique area to the west of St. George’s Lane, it is vital that approval to build these two houses is not given.
Julian Lawrence

Section  Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  99

Comment  I think that scenario 1 option 1 would be more than enough for this area Reydon and southwold have plenty of brown field sites and in fill sites earmarked already. For housing .This area is an area of ONB and encroaching on more green land is ludicrous. The services and utilities cannot cope as it is. Water /sewage is overstretched. the doctors dentist and school etc. has waiting lists and long waits for appointments already. Children are already being bussed out on mass as no secondary school. Traffic into Swold and area is nonstop already on the Halesworth road and people in Keens lane and area already find it a problem to access the road. This would add to mass overdevelopment for a village that is at the edge of nowhere with hardly any employment .where would all of the people work ,They would have to commute adding to more pollution ,road chaos and congestion .There are already enough second /holiday homes also in area so we do not need more of them either. Pease be realistic about the future plans at least and choosing sites a community that just copes with its services and utilities and employment would be overwhelmed and change it completely.
Kevin Kinsella

**Section**
Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

**Comment ID**
1219

**Comment**
As for the St Felix playing fields, our objection to that plan has already been lodged with your good selves and a copy can be found in this thread at the bottom of this section. We would ask you to take note of those objections in this consultation too.


Please be advised that we strongly object to this application for the following reasons:

1. The site is in an AONB and is therefore protected from development...
2. The site is outside the approved village physical limits of Reydon and this should not be breached...
3. Other brownfield sites are available in Southwold...
4. The site is immediately adjacent to a sensitive County Wildlife Site and bats and other protected and/or valued wildlife thrives in the area...
5. The site is designated Open Space, so any development is wholly inappropriate. Light pollution and other undesirable impacts upon the environment will result...
6. I note Sport England’s unequivocal and strong objection to the application and wholeheartedly support their position. We would though, further emphasise that community sports clubs, such as Southwold Rugby Club, make extensive use of the existing playing fields...
7. These new houses will almost certainly turn out to be mainly second homes. All recent new housing developments in both Reydon and Southwold have a 'second home' occupancy of at least 50% and many become empty properties for a large amount of the time...
8. These are very unlikely to be 'starter' homes. It is not clear to us where the jobs or employment prospects for those, expensive, homes are, or will be...
9. As to affordable homes, there are currently 54 affordable houses either being built, or planned, in the local area. We are not aware of any discernible evidence that there is a need for another 24...
10. Central to Saint Felix Schools application, appears to be a financial case whose supporting documentation is not being made available to the public. It therefore cannot be taken into account when determining this...
application. Similarly, as Sport England noted, no matter what the school intends to do with the funds, none of that comprises any part of this application and as such, none of it can be taken into account when assessing the merits of the application...

11. The proposed access road onto Halesworth Road is at a dangerous point. We note that the previous application permission for egress onto the Halesworth Road was denied...

12. There is a threat to the Holm Oaks especially from the new roadway... We therefore strongly object to this planning proposal and ask that it be refused.
Kimberley Martin

Section: Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID: 949

Comment: Any sites allowed for building should be small sites and the St Felix site should be removed from consideration. The St Felix site is in an area of AONB and in the absence of needs that cannot be met from other sites should not be considered. Also it is a playing field in current use and according to government legislation could only be considered if other conditions were met. It is the subject of a current application and Sport England has strongly and correctly objected.
Margaret Dinn

Section  
Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  
716

Comment  
I strongly oppose the development of the fields to the west of Keens Lane and the Saint Felix playing fields (sites 117, 118, and 138) as: i/ access to these sites from the Halesworth Road (A1095) would be next to a blind corner-or in a blind dip and would increase traffic on a dangerous stretch of road; ii/ developing these areas of AONB land would have a massive impact on a landscape that forms a gateway to Southwold and Reydon; and iii/ developing sites 118 and 117 would create an urban sprawl and no doubt encourage the landowner to seek permission to fill-in the remaining land framed by the Adnams distribution centre and the solar farm.
Mr & Mrs McNally

Section
Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID
209

Comment
We attended the meeting on Tuesday 10 May to view the Waveney Local Plan. We were surprised to see so many homes planned for Reydon. Is there really a need for this amount of extra housing in this area?
We asked the Planning Officer if the necessary infrastructure would be put in place prior to or at the same time the homes would be built. We were shocked to be told that this would not be the case and their remit was just to built houses and there was no link up with any necessary services. We pointed out that there are currently long waiting times for appointments at the Health Centre and treatment times at the James Paget A&E are below targets. The Planning Officer said that shortage of doctors is a nationwide problem and any improvements needed cannot be part of the housing development plan. There also appears to be no firm plans proposed for more school places, jobs, shops, sewage capacity etc. for the 972 homes mentioned.
It would appear that the area will be overdeveloped to provide housing with no thought for the well being of existing or new residents. Surely this cannot be right and we are writing to ask what action you will be taking.
There is also the concern that a lot of the new property will be second homes and holiday lets and wonder if you will be considering adopting the St Ives ruling of not allowing this type of person to purchase new properties. This would make it less attractive to developers to build such large housing developments.
One last point when does a village enlarge so much to qualify to become a town?
**Parke**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

**Comment ID**  
11

**Comment**  
Completely unsuitable, for all the reasons given in the objections to this, as described in and submitted to planning application DC/15/3288/OUT. Urbanisation in an AONB.
Kerry Pace

Section  Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  60

Comment  The environmental impact, the increased traffic, the over development of an area of outstanding natural beauty, are all reasons why this proposition should not proceed in its current form. The proposal is to build simply too many houses on this patch of land. Access would affect the 'gateway to Southwold', and it's hard to see how the additional traffic could be managed properly without causing major disruption and delays.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pamela Morris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | Please delete areas in 117, 118, 138  
All these are large areas and all off the very busy rural A1095. Any development in any one of these areas would be in excess of the % new dwellings sought and would change a village to a town. This is an area where affordable homes are not required; developers would building houses as holiday or second homes for excess profit. Very many other reasons could be given. |
Reydon Parish Council Jean Brown

Section | Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID | 1134

Comment | [Therefore,] none of the proposed large sites offered for development around Reydon (5, 6, 38, 117, 18, 138 in the options consultation, p51) will be needed and we believe these should not be considered for designation as development sites in the final Local Plan. Our residents strongly opposed the expansion of the village envelope in their response to the consultation for our Village Plan in 2014 which was confirmed more recently in the public response to the current application to develop land at St Felix School (site 138). There is simply no case for major development of housing or business accommodation on any of these sites, given the analysis of the housing needs set out above and the availability of undeveloped land at the current Reydon Business Park.
russell martin

Section  
Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  674

Comment  
The area numbered 138 is, I understand, in an AONB, and I cannot believe it would be sensible to set precedents by allowing building on land designated as such. I have made more detailed comments below.
Area 138 should be removed entirely – this is in an area of AONB and development would require removal of protected trees. The size of and location of other areas is better. Also the suggestion that this site is included seems to be nothing other than a fall-back position by the applicants of a current planning application, which has every possibility of being rejected.
Ruth & John Pigneguy

Section  
Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  
170

Comment  
Many residents have moved here to live in a semi-natural area. These sites look like massive over-development. Second homes need to be controlled so that we can have local full time residents living here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The area referred to in this location is in an area of AONB and outside the curtilage of the village boundary of Reydon. It is actively used as a sports field by both St Felix School and Southwold Rugby Club as a practice ground. Experience has shown that any attempt to build affordable homes in this location fails due to the lack of work opportunities in this area. It is undeniable that any attempt to provide affordable homes results in an increase of second/holiday homes when they are sold off due to lack of purchasers in the lower socio-economic strata to which these homes are targeted. The lower paid simply cannot afford &quot;affordable housing&quot; in this area where there is no work opportunity. In the adjacent St George’s Square, eleven of the nineteen properties built there are second/holiday homes and infrequently occupied. The key worker houses built with this development were eventually sold off to the highest bidder due to lack of interest from the market at which they were aimed. Building more will only add to the already economically negative stock of empty houses with little social benefit to the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Simon Clack

Section  Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID  946

Comment  As regards the sites to the west and south of Keens Lane (site numbers 138, 116, and 117), I believe that they should all be excluded from any further consideration. The reasons for not developing the Saint Felix playing fields have already been well rehearsed (cf the comments made by local residents and organisations such as Sport England regarding planning reference: DC/15/3288/OUT) and many of the same arguments also apply to site numbers 116 and 117, specifically: a/ the land enjoys AONB status and there seems to be no reason why the Planning Inspectorates' recent decision regarding the proposed Reydon Smere development (cf APP/T3535/W/15/3131802) should not also apply to this area; b/ any vehicular access points from the A1095 would have to be located next to a blind corner or in a blind dip and would increase traffic on an already dangerous stretch of road. Any measures to remedy this situation (i.e. a roundabout) would only serve to further harm the character and appearance of the main gateway to Southwold & Reydon from the south; c/ developing these sites will encourage the landowner to fill-in the area between the solar farm and the Adnams distribution centre; and e/ the sites abut a pair of Grade II listed properties at the end of Keens Lane.
Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear

Section | Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

Comment ID | 617

Comment | We believe this site is unsuitable for development for the reasons given in our objection to the current planning application. The site is a playing field in open countryside which is part of the AONB. There is poor access for the traffic that would be generated by the proposed development onto the busy Halesworth Road. The sewage infrastructure is already at or beyond capacity, there is no adequate replacement for the lost sports facilities. Not only is the site unsuitable for all these reasons, no development on this scale is required in Southwold and Reydon to meet the targets for housing in this area of the district if the option is adopted to concentrate growth in Lowestoft. We regard this as the best option economically and as part of the much needed regeneration of Lowestoft.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

**Section**  
Potential land for development 138 - Saint Felix School (land between St Georges Square and Lakeside Park Drive), Halesworth Road, Reydon

**Comment ID**  
756

**Comment**  
Site 138 is adjacent to St Felix School Grounds CWS and, based on aerial photographs, may also contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that this site should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on either the CWS or any existing ecological value that the site has.
Potential land for development 139 - Shoe Devil Lane, Ilketshall St Margaret

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 139 - Shoe Devil Lane, Ilketshall St Margaret</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Church of St Margaret grade I listed to south west and various Grade II farmhouses around the village including Church Farmhouse, Corner Farmhouse, Ropers Farmhouse, Shoe Devil Farmhouse and barn and School farmhouse. Potential impact on setting of high grade listed building and other listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilketshall St Margaret Parish Meeting Jane Waring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 139 - Shoe Devil Lane, Ilketshall St Margaret</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>139 - Shoe Devil Lane - this site is not appropriate for development as the electric, water and broadband services to the village are stretched to capacity and any development would also require significant alterations to the narrow lane for access. Shoe Devil Farm at the end of the lane is a local landmark and as such would be adversely affected by development in such close proximity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 140 - Site to the rear of 51 Old Station Road (1), Halesworth

Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section
Potential land for development 140 - Site to the rear of 51 Old Station Road (1), Halesworth

Comment ID
1194

Comment
The sites further north 106, 140, 141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town. There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 140 - Site to the rear of 51 Old Station Road (1), Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Wissett Hall grade II to north west. Potential impact on setting of Listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section Potential land for development 140 - Site to the rear of 51 Old Station Road (1), Halesworth

Comment ID 808

Comment Site 106; 140; 141 the creation of 87 houses lacks adequate infrastructure on Wissett Road leading to Norwich Road, the narrowest junction in Halesworth, with the danger of increased traffic bordering the Edgar Sewter School.
Potential land for development 141 - Site to the rear of 51 Old Station Road, Halesworth (2), Wissett

Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section: Potential land for development 141 - Site to the rear of 51 Old Station Road, Halesworth (2), Wissett

Comment ID: 1195

Comment: The sites further north 106,140,141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town.

There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Historic England Debbie Mack</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section:  Potential land for development 141 - Site to the rear of 51 Old Station Road, Halesworth (2), Wissett

Comment ID:  809

Comment:  Site 106; 140; 141 the creation of 87 houses lacks adequate infrastructure on Wissett Road leading to Norwich Road, the narrowest junction in Halesworth, with the danger of increased traffic bordering the Edgar Sewter School.
Potential land for development 142 - Southwold Police Station and former Fire Station site, Blyth Road, Southwold

*Historic England Debbie Mack*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 142 - Southwold Police Station and former Fire Station site, Blyth Road, Southwold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Adjacent to Southwold Conservation Area - Potential impact upon views into and out of Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Elmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 142 - Southwold Police Station and former Fire Station site, Blyth Road, Southwold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Is already proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kevin Cross

Section  | Potential land for development 142 - Southwold Police Station and former Fire Station site, Blyth Road, Southwold

Comment ID | 26

Comment | The former police & fire station land at Southwold is below the 5m contour line on the OS map. Homes would therefore always be at risk of flooding (unless you build them on stilts or similar.)
Kevin Kinsella

Potential land for development 142 - Southwold Police Station and former Fire Station site, Blyth Road, Southwold

Comment ID 1216

Comment Some of the sites are significant in size and are clearly outside of the existing boundaries. Any housing expansion should be kept to identified sites within the boundary. As such we would not have an objection to the construction of housing on the site accommodating the Southwold police station and the old fire station (site no. 142: 40 homes) but we are opposed to all the other sites. We would also draw your attention to the fact that there are a number of other, potentially brown field sites, that are likely to become available between now and 2036.
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section: Potential land for development 142 - Southwold Police Station and former Fire Station site, Blyth Road, Southwold

Comment ID: 956

Comment:
- Sites suitable for development:
  142 Southwold Police Station and former Fire Station site, Blythe Road
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Peter and Deborah Gillatt</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwold and Reydon Society Philip O'Hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwold Town Council Lesley Beevor

Section Potential land for development 142 - Southwold Police Station and former Fire Station site, Blyth Road, Southwold

Comment ID 1096

Comment The number of units that can be built on Site 142 in Southwold is grossly overestimated, and could not be achieved within the Ingleton Wood Design Framework, which will be part of our Neighbourhood Plan. If built as proposed, this would create a density of 137.9 units/hectare on the Fire/Police Station site, which is nearly three times as much as the current average density of new or proposed build in Southwold, which is 77.7 units/hectare. (This includes Tibby's Triangle, Station Road and Duncan's Yard. Housing without garden space is attractive to the second home/buy to invest/buy to let markets. We are seeking to limit these markets in Southwold in order to rebuild our population and create a more diverse demographic. We would like to see a mix of housing for different needs, as required by the NPPF. This includes families and younger retired people who seek garden space.
Potential land for development 143 - St James Lane, St James South Elmham

Historic England Debbie Mack

Section
Potential land for development 143 - St James Lane, St James South Elmham

Comment ID
1089

Comment
Elm Farmhouse grade II to east. Church Farm grade I. Church of St James grade I and Moated site Scheduled Monument to north east. Potential impact upon setting of high grade listed buildings and Scheduled Monument.
Janet Holden

Section  Potential land for development 143 - St James Lane, St James South Elmham

Comment ID  84

Comment  St James South Elmham does not have the infrastructure to increase in size, there are no buses or transport that runs on a regular basis, the nearest schools are a distance away for both primary and secondary pupils. I am concerned that increasing the size of the village, where we don't have mains drainage, where power supply is often interrupted and where residents had to pay for BT to install superfast broadband will add further pressure to an overstretched infrastructure. The development will increase traffic through the village on roads that are falling apart and poorly maintained. The fact that there is no public transport and that new developments often are occupied by families with children will mean that school run traffic will cause significant road safety concerns to pedestrians especially because there are no pavements through the village and the road is already heavily used by agricultural vehicles. In addition there are no facilities in the village, no shop no pub, no opportunities for young people's leisure, which means that the development will just result in people simply living in the location with no opportunity to support and build the community.
Michael Fontenoy

Section Potential land for development 143 - St James Lane, St James South Elmham

Comment ID 88

Comment St James is a village with poor transport links, it has been said that you find it when you are lost. It is a mainly agricultural village still and therefore has lots of large agricultural vehicular movements on lanes which they just fit into. Public transport is non existent, a community transport bus provides a service to a different town once each day and is no use for commuting. There are no schools, shops, pubs or other typical infrastructure all meaning that everyone in the village drives somewhere to do anything. Those who do not or cannot drive are trapped. Superfast Broadband only came to the village because people in the village paid for the connections instead of waiting years. Power is not assured with regular outages in winter, and low amperage is a common occurrence. Low water pressure is another factor to take consideration. The number of houses suggested for the sites in St James would double the size of the village and the council will need to seriously consider how to overcome elements described above. The existing housing stock is not densely situated and the number of houses would change the character of the village.
On behalf of my sisters and myself, I submitted a proposal for two areas of potential development land in St James South Elmham, sites referenced as 143 and 150 in your consultation document. We were rather surprised to see in your document that these have been identified as having possible room for 33 and 93 houses respectively, including a care home on the latter site.

We recognise that these housing figures are based on the standard densities you use for calculating a site’s potential, but obviously in a small village such as St James, housing groupings of this size would create an over-dominant development. If these areas are included in your final plan we would therefore seek to work with Waveney Planning Department to create a development suitable for the village.
St James South Elmham Parish Meeting Mary Henry

Section  
Potential land for development 143 - St James Lane, St James South Elmham

Comment ID  
432

Comment  
Your Help Plan Our Future booklet shows (p 53) that two sites in St James South Elmham have been put forward by a developer/landowner as having potential for housing development and being suitable for inclusion in the local plan. We have the following comments about these two sites:

1. The maps show two large areas fronting The Street and St James Lane with capacity for 93 and 33 homes respectively – 126 in total. Having spoken to the landowner, the origin of these numbers is unknown, and it is not believed they formed part of the proposition made in response to this consultation. It is thought they were added by WDC.

2. As noted above, the village currently has 88 homes. This development would increase the size of the village by about 150%. We believe this is wholly disproportionate to the size of the village.

3. The development would also represent 50 times as many houses as would be a proportionate increase for the village under the scenario examined under Q7 above and be inconsistent with a housing strategy based on that approach.

4. It would imply a population rise from 205 to almost 500 and be significantly beyond the available infrastructure's ability to cope and beyond the scope of the current amenities. The communal village facilities are limited to a hall, a church, a village orchard and small wood.

5. The village is agricultural at heart and set in a deeply rural area. There is no likelihood of local employment needs generating housing demand of this scale.

6. The nature of the village is reflected in its structure and character, with agriculture coming right into the heart of the village. Development on this scale and on these sites would remove that distinctive feature and destroy the nature and cohesion of the community.

7. We do believe that some small growth in housing in the village, fitting with its size and character, on appropriate sites, and consistent with the rural area percentage as noted in Q7, above, could be considered.

In summary, the proposed St James developments are inappropriate sites, massively disproportionate in scale, unnecessary in the context of any of the Waveney development scenarios, unsustainable by the existing infrastructure, and damaging to the structure, style and character of the
village. Small levels of additional development (up to 1 – 2 homes per year) might be sustainable and useful. I hope these comments and observations will be useful. Should you have any questions about the content of this response do not hesitate to contact me.
Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Molls Lane, Brampton with Stoven

Anonymous

Section
Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Molls Lane, Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID
354

Comment
I object to the proposed site (144) along Station Road and Moll's Lane, Brampton because:
1. It is not 'infilling'
2. It is prime agricultural land
3. Molls Lane is too narrow for yet more traffic and has a difficult turning off Station Road, especially from the station direction.
4. There is no 'green' transport for working people. We have a limited bus service to Beccles and Southwold, none to Halesworth and the station is over a mile away with a very small permissive parking area.
5. We have no shop, PO, pub
6. A long walk to the school so possible more car journeys.
7. There is a large ditch which, I believe, should be left for drainage and wildlife. Many ditches are piped to the detriment of the environment.
Thank you for your time and I look forward to your reply.
Alexander Carr

Section Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Molls Lane, Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID 921

Comment I have been given a copy of your interactive map showing site 144 for potential development in Station Road and Molls Lane, Brampton for 15 new houses.

I understand that many of the proposed sites may not be required for development but cannot assure planning permission will not be granted.

Some years ago I contacted Waveney District Council and was told the place homes could be built in Molls Lane was on the field running from the vicarage (next to the telephone box) down to the Lower Road and that all other land was registered agricultural and could not be built on.

I very much hope the above still stands and the proposals for Station Road and Molls Lane will be removed from your present proposals.
B Carroll

Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Molls Lane, Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID 316

Comment

I understand from your new Local Plan that there is proposal to build 15 new homes in this area plus a possible further 50 and 90 near Redisham. We will need more transport facilities than we have now, unless they all have a car each, which will mean 30 more cars using the lanes. A roundabout will need to be constructed at the junction of Molls Lane and Station Road to slow down the traffic coming from Redisham (30 miles an hour signs do not mean anything to some drivers) even coming round an S bend which Molls Lane comes out on.

The junction at the A145 will need to be improved. Look right and you are looking at a line pylons and road signs, look left and you have to ease into the road to see pass the Brampton Dog hedge.

Obviously, with children we will need a crossing over the A145 for them to reach the school.

Pavements will be required for people to walk along and street lighting for the winter months. We have none of these at the moment. Molls have a few street lights.

JOBS JOBS where will these people work?

Doctors! Where will these new people go. 900 homes in Beccles. Possibly 155 in Brampton and Redisham- at least two people per home. The doctors are struggling now. The NHS Trust cannot shut down facilities quick enough when they should be building more.

Electricity supply will need to be increased, sewers improved, increase water supply, telephone access, must not forget internet access, and drainage. We have a high water table with heavy clay soil, good drainage is essential. The ditches must be maintained. I would not expect a repeat of Carlton Colville where the builder of the Mardle made sure his buildings were alright, but flooded the original village houses.

I understand you are having to comply with government orders, but these market towns with their old roads built in the days of the horse and cart cannot cope. People move to the villages from the cities, but still want town facilities. We do not have a pub or shop. A farm shop has recently opened in Shadingfield, the next village on the A145, and the local Post office in Westall then it is either Beccles, Halesworth, Bungay or Southwold.
**Historic England Debbie Mack**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Molls Lane, Brampton with Stoven

**Comment ID**  
1090

**Comment**  
Manor Farmhouse grade II listed building to east. Potential impact upon setting of listed building.
Jeremy Arnold

Section Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Molls Lane, Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID 588

Comment Brampton Suffolk is a village with very dispersed housing and without a proper centre, no shop, no pub. It is possible to drive for over two miles within the village boundaries with mainly fields on either side of the road, and just the occasional house. The area of Brampton that is the closest to being a village centre is the part closest to the Primary School, Church, Village Hall, Bowls Club and former Brampton Dog pub. In my opinion, any housing development in Brampton should occur in this area, so helping to build a village with a proper centre. Therefore I would support developments such as proposals Nos 92 and 93 on Southwold Road close to the Primary School. (At the moment Southwold Road is frequently constricted by parked vehicles, and could therefore be usefully widened in this area.)

With regard to the proposed ribbon development along Molls lane, proposal No. 144, presumably of "executive" type houses, for the reasons mentioned above, I consider this inappropriate. If this land owner wants development on his land, then I suggest a much more appropriate area, part of what I think is the same field, would be a new road driven in from Station Road between the Bowls Club and the driveway to Manor Farm, no ribbon development, and the new houses on the new road, such as has already been done with Old School Close. Being close to the Primary School, Children's Playground, Village Hall etc. my suggested area would be helping to develop a village centre as mentioned above.

(** Anyone doubting my claim to drive in Brampton for over two miles with mainly fields on either side of the road, I am referring to driving from the Brampton / Shadingfield boundary on the A145 London Road, via Station Road to Brampton Station, according to Google Maps a distance of 2.4 miles, and passing about 15 houses next to the road!)
Les Tarver

Section

Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Molls Lane, Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID

245

Comment

I object to this proposal for the following reasons:-
There is no shop, post office etc in the village and journeys to such facilities will involve car journeys in the vast majority of cases.
The land involved is prime agricultural land.
The proposal does not contribute to reducing private car journeys and promoting the use of public transport. If occupants of the proposed dwellings work out of the village they will have to drive. There is no public transport suitable for journeys to any destination which would enable people to travel to and fro even for basic 9 - 5 work hours and Molls Lane, in particular, is too narrow for an increase in daily bus journeys. Please note that the railway station (the only option for travel to nearby Halesworth and points south and a possible option for journeys to Beccles and Lowestoft) is up to one and a half miles from the site along a road with no footpath and dangerous bends for pedestrians. The station car-park is small and privately owned and inadequate for current needs, let alone increased use. The school is up to a mile from this site, again along roads with no footpath and with a crossing of an A road (the A145) at a junction with limited visibility. Journeys to and from the primary school are thus inevitably going to be by car.
I believe that any new local plan should have at its core consideration of 'green' issues, particularly reducing the number of private vehicle journeys and facilitating the use of public transport. By this yardstick the proposal is seriously flawed.
Lynn Durkin

**Section**  
Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Molls Lane, Brampton with Stoven

**Comment ID**  
202

**Comment**  
We believe this land is totally unsuitable for development because, it is a country site there is nothing this side of Brampton, no shop, no pub, no school, just open fields and that is how the people who live here want it to stay, that's why we moved here!

Both roads are very narrow country roads with a dangerous sharp bend on the corner, where there has been numerous near accidents in the past with tractors, lorries, with the extra volume of traffic both from the site being developed and once developed there will be a serious accident(s) in the future. This side of Brampton also has no mains gas supplies and at times invariable drainage problems, Station road has no street lighting, Molls Lane has limited. No pavements on both roads.

Please look at other options.

Thank You

Mr & Mrs Durkin
Middleton

Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Molls Lane, Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID 521

Comment
Whilst not directly affected by this proposal, I do think that building new houses on this site is not a good idea. All new residents in Brampton will have to travel several miles by car to shop as there are no shops nearby. The bus service is inadequate for shopping purposes, there is little chance that the service will improve, and there is no guarantee that Anglian Buses will even continue visiting Station Road and Molls Lane.

The adverse affect on the environment would appear to be far less if new homes were built close to Beccles. Accessing the A145 from Station Road is not good with regard to viewing traffic coming from the Beccles direction. There is 30mph speed restriction on the A145 at this junction, but seldom observed.

The value of some of the existing properties on Molls Lane will undoubtedly be adversely affected. The open views across the fields will be lost and their properties will be overlooked.

If the Council do decide to allow new houses to be built in this area, then surely using the land on the north side of Station Road would be far better. This would not adversely affect existing properties, and would give the new residents uninterrupted views across open fields to the north and south. I believe that the owner of the site number 144 also owns this land.
Ray Edwards

Section Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Moll's Lane, Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID 874

Comment I realize that at the moment this is future planning but the proposal by Waveney District Council to earmark land to build houses in Moll's Lane, is very strange as several years ago as the then District Council turned down a similar scheme as unsuitable on the same piece of land when proposed by a different farmer. So what has changed? The lane is still narrow and many of the vehicles that use this land exceed the speed limit by quite some margin. The very large field has little drainage for such a huge area and ditches have not had any cleaning in the last 25 years that I know of. The Vicarage halfway down Moll's Lane has been vacant since October 2015 due to subsidence caused by the unstable conditions of the clay subsoil as is our bungalow also.
In winters of snowfall Moll's Lane becomes completely blocked with massive snow drifts and as winds can and do blow snow all the way from Shadingfield and is not cleared by the County Council!
Lastly the corner of Moll's Lane and Station Road is a death trap if travelling from Brampton Station and making a right turn into Moll's Lane, the maximum distance one can see down the road is only a few metres, it is so bad that I never attempt it as the near misses and minor bumps that drivers experience are just warnings of a possible fearful accident. (photos enclosed)
Stephen Fuller

Section
Potential land for development 144 - Station Road and Molls Lane,
Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID
437

Comment
I wish to object strongly to the proposed development of 15 homes in Molls Lane, Brampton (Site No. 144).
Brampton is a dispersed settlement where development proposals should be considered very carefully; infilling would ruin the character of the village while estate development would totally overwhelm it.
My reasons for objection are:
* A previous planning application for 17 dwellings in Molls Lane, Brampton (DC/89/1090/OUT) was refused back in 1989 on the grounds "that it would be an undesirable addition for which there is no overriding justification to an area of scattered development beyond the main built-up area of Brampton". There has been no change in circumstances in the area since this date, therefore these grounds still apply.
* Complete lack of local infrastructure:
o No local shop – the closest shop is 2 miles away in Westhall. The current proprietor is in his 90's and the shop is likely to close on his retirement.
o Unsuitable country lanes – there's no pedestrian pavement and several dangerous blind bends on adjoining roads. An increase in traffic will therefore increase the risk of potential accidents
o Molls Lane is single lane and totally unsuitable for our modern 21st Century world of regular internet deliveries via large vans and lorries. This is already evident today and will only get worse.
o The inadequacy of Molls Lane to accommodate even small increases in traffic, and because road widening would destroy ancient field boundaries. Geographically a number of hedge-line drainage ditches have been filled in without the correct understanding of the impact on local housing; this has resulted in building damage. With the addition of a high water table any development would impact on the local rainwater drainage.
o Nearest train station is 1.5 miles away. Access by foot is highly dangerous down unlit, narrow, country lanes with no pavements. Onsite parking is extremely limited.
o No high speed broadband
o No mains gas – new houses would have to use oil heating which is not environmentally friendly.
o Public sewers are inadequate for additional housing
* Loss of high quality agricultural land and potentially trees. The Government has communicated through various types of media that agricultural land is essential for food production.
* Lack of local employment – the nearest areas of major employment are Norwich & Ipswich.
* There are better alternative sites available – priority should be given to "brown field" sites rather than "green field" sites.
Potential land for development 145 - The Bull Field, Ringsfield Road, Beccles

Beccles Town Council C Boyne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 145 - The Bull Field, Ringsfield Road, Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Whilst the council appreciate the need for development in the area over the next twenty years, it must be handled with great care as the infrastructure in Beccles is at breaking point now, especially the Health Centre. With this in mind, it is felt that any housing development should be restricted to the area to the South West on one or two of the sites numbered 24, 43, 108, 145 and 156, as this makes the best use of the existing and planned road infrastructure. However, this area would require a new primary school and a convenience store and other associated infrastructure to service any expansion. In addition, the two small sites in Beccles, numbers 1 and 16 and site number 60 in Worlingham could also be included as sites for development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Garry Nicolaou Kiriakis  

Section: Potential land for development 145 - The Bull Field, Ringsfield Road, Beccles  

Comment ID: 919  

Comment: As someone who backs onto site no 145 I am horrified that I had no notification of any planning proposals or consultation process from WDC. I was only notified through word of mouth. I have major concerns that should this site be developed for c. 90 homes the infrastructure surrounding the site would be wholly inadequate. Already the volume of traffic at the SJH school and Beccles Sports Centre causes congestion, parking difficulties and poses a traffic safety risk especially during term times and throughout the weekend (sports activity). The use of this greenfield site would have an immediate impact on local residents and on the extensive wildlife that occupies the margins of the site and surrounding area. I would suggest that if development had to take place it should happen nearer to the proposed southern link road so that current residents are not adversely affected. 90 houses would need more roads, more schools, more recreation facilities and I believe this is not the most appropriate site to develop these requirements. Just to give you some idea of the wildlife that would be affected, here is a list of species I have spotted in the margins of the field, in the trees in the field and in my garden (plot 145)  
Mammals – Pipistrelle and noctule bats, hedgehogs, squirrel, fox, muntjac deer  
Amphibians – frogs, toads (and hence probably newts) in the dyke surrounding the plot.  
Resident bird species – barn, tawny and little owls in oak trees in the plot. GS woodpecker, LS woodpecker, Green woodpecker, bull finch, pheasant, partridge, siskin, yellow hammer Brambling, wood pigeon, collared dove, mistle thrush, song thrush, gold finch, treecreeper, blue, great and coal tit, long tailed tit, chaffinch, house sparrow, greenfinch.  
Migrant species – turtle dove, white throat, black cap, willow warbler, chiffchaff, redwings, fieldfares.  
Developing this site would impact directly on these species.
Geoffrey Nobbs

Section | Potential land for development 145 - The Bull Field, Ringsfield Road, Beccles

Comment ID | 419

Comment | This proposed site has problems of access in that the only options are for traffic to enter and leave via either Ringsfield Road or Meadow Gardens. In the case of Ringsfield Road access would be in the vicinity of a sharp double bend next to the Sir John Leman School Playing Field and then continue past the Sir John Leman School; and then St Benet's Primary School before having to cross the junction at St Mary's Road. This option also has the problem of the associated traffic with the two schools along Ringsfield Road where there are considerable numbers of parked vehicles during the working day as well as school buses which reduce the road to a single lane for a considerable length at times. The other option means traffic passing along the narrow Meadow Gardens before having the option of turning right into South Road and continuing on to London Road. South Road narrows considerably in the vicinity of the Cemetery before joining London Road near a pedestrian crossing. The proposed development suggests at least 94 dwellings which could equate to a significant number of vehicle movements during the day onto two roads with problems. It must be assumed that the majority of residents on this site would need the use of a car to travel to and from their places of work.

The field itself although farmed has a number of mature trees within the field rather than on the boundaries which form part of the area’s biodiversity and should be protected. In addition there is a margin of land left unfarmed on the North side of the field providing cover for nesting birds etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 145 - The Bull Field, Ringsfield Road, Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity of grade II* Ashman's Hall to north west and Conservation Area to the east. Potential impact to setting of high grade Listed Building and Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McGregor

Section  
Potential land for development 145 - The Bull Field, Ringsfield Road, Beccles

Comment ID  
492

Comment  
The development of this site would bring disproportionate disruption to a particularly quiet area of town in relation to the amount of housing it would provide.
If it was to be developed I would recommend a low density site of single storey buildings that are adapted specifically for elderly or people with limited mobility.
The surrounding roads already face heavy use due to there being two schools and a leisure centre nearby so more vehicles would be a huge detriment. In fact many children walk or cycle in this area so it would make it less safe for them.
It would also mean more vehicles having to go through the centre of town to get to the ring road or shops. Ringsfield road offers visitors an appealing entrance into the area which would be compromised by more development and it would significantly unbalance the feel of the town.
Mr R & Mrs P Crack

Section Potential land for development 145 - The Bull Field, Ringsfield Road, Beccles

Comment ID 94

Comment We have concerns regarding:
1. Road Access
2. Ability of community services to cope.
3. Ability of existing water, sewerage and drainage systems to cope.
4. Lack of Public transport serving the area

1. Road Access
The site is in close proximity to the Sir John Leman High School. Ringsfield Road is very congested on school days, with extra cars parked along the road and in neighbouring streets. South Road has had pavements widened, but the remaining road width causes many near misses - it is not suitable for 2 way traffic, and any additional traffic would add to this problem. Meadow Gardens is currently a dead end with little space for passing parked cars (it also has the cycle path entrance/exit to/from London Road). Any changes in traffic flow or volume could compromise the safety of those using the cycle path, which was introduced to provide a safer means of accessing this part of town. Please also see item 4 below.

2. Ability of Community Services to Cope with Extra Demand
The Beccles Medical Centre and local pharmacies are already stretched beyond acceptable limits. There is a shortage of GPS and other vital health and social service workers which means the local services cannot adequately serve the current population. Any additional residential developments (especially those which are designed with elderly people in mind) would add to these pressures. The Sir John Leman High School already has to turn away prospective pupils as it is full. Where will these new residents access work, education, healthcare and social support?

3. Ability of Existing Water, Sewerage & Drainage Systems to Cope
There have been previous issues in the area regarding water pressure. Sewerage systems already struggle to cope with demand. Heavy rains result in flooding. The existing infrastructure struggles to cope. What assurances are there that any proposed developments will not add to these problems?

4. Lack of Public Transport Servicing the Area
Although there are several bus stops in the South Road and Upper Grange area, most of these are not currently served by public transport. Indeed, in several cases, by the time the installation of the bus stops and kerbs was
completed, the buses were no longer serving this area. If the proposed development goes ahead, how are the residents expected to get about? Those with a car will simply add to the daily Beccles gridlock and the hunt for a town centre parking space. If they need to go to the Medical Centre there is limited parking when they get there. Those without a car face a long walk into town with very few resting opportunities en route, or an expensive taxi journey. It may well be possible for the existing cycle path network to be extended into this development, but not everyone is able to ride, or afford, a bicycle. With increased traffic volume both cycling and walking become a less attractive option due to safety concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rowbottom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul Leman

Section  Potential land for development 145 - The Bull Field, Ringsfield Road, Beccles

Comment ID  331

Comment  I do not think this site is suitable for housing / development for the following reasons:
If there is to be any access via Ringsfield Road, there is a definite safety issue. Ringsfield Road is generally very congested, Not just during school hours, but also weekends and evenings, given the popularity of the Sports Centre and playing field. Much of the time the road is single width only. We have to time our car journeys to and from our property to avoid the worst of the congestion. Visibility on the road is compromised by parked / stationary vehicles, making road conditions dangerous. This has resulted in damaged vehicles and accidents. Any additional traffic on the road will exacerbate this situation.
The Medical Centre in Beccles is already stretched, any further development will put a further strain on this facility.
There is an issue with drainage on the Bull Field which raises serious concerns.
The Bull Field contains several mature oak trees which need to be conserved One of the trees is a protected owl nesting site, with limitations on encroachment. There is also a considerable amount of bird and mammal activity which enhances our future environment and should be protected.
The majority of local people who may be effected, are not aware of this proposal. Not everyone takes a local paper, so people need to be informed and given the opportunity to voice their opinion, to obtain a balanced view.
Paul & Helga Leman
Rosemary Shaw

Section Potential land for development 145 - The Bull Field, Ringsfield Road, Beccles

Comment ID 558

Comment I am writing with reference to sites 145 and 24. The development of these sites would increase traffic on Ringsfield Road, which the proposed new road linking London Road to the Ellough Industrial Estate would not extend to. Traffic from these two sites would go into the town centre and congestion outside both the schools on Ringsfield Road (Sir John Leman High and St Benet’s primary) would increase. Ringsfield Rd is also part of the national cycle route network (route 1). If Ringsfield road is developed in this way, the logical corollary will be that pressure will mount for a south-western distributor road to link London Rd with the B1062, whereas the whole purpose of the new southern relief road in Beccles is to channel traffic onto the A146.

The most sustainable sites for development are those which would be served by the new road to the south, namely site numbers 8, 9, 81, 82 and 107 - and this would also apply to sites like number 124. It would also make sense if these sites (8, 9, 81, 82, 107) had good cycle paths and walkways into the centre of Beccles even though they would primarily be served by the new southern relief/distributor road for motor vehicles.
Rosemary Simpson

Section Potential land for development 145 - The Bull Field, Ringsfield Road, Beccles

Comment ID 483

Comment My concerns for this site are as follows; for a small development it will have a huge impact on small local roads, ringsfield rd and South road. These two roads already have extreme congestion with school run and school busses from two schools twice a day plus a liesure centre. The junction of ringsfield and St Mary’s is particularly perilous for most drivers. Also there is no capacity for the schools to expand including nearby Albert Pye as this has already accrued recently. The surrounding roads are already choke points at the bottom of south Rd and Ashmans Rd.

It would be an advantage for a new development to include the ability to build new schools I propose sites 8,9,81,82 and 62 as this also would include the new link road which the new houses need to feed into.

This field also is hunting ground for local Owls.

The houses at the end of Meadow gardens have a risk of flooding, a development would increase this risk.
Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow

Alison Arnold

Section Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow

Comment ID 496

Comment This site is just in front of a Grade II listed building, the former workhouse, which is now known as Viewpoint Mews. Developing on this land would take away the beauty and originality of this site and detract from the attraction of living in the workhouse development. It would affect the view from the properties and most likely would also affect the prices of these properties. Shipmeadow is a little hamlet with no facilities except for a farm shop which is most appropriate to the area. We would not want any other shops etc., that would inevitably be campaigned for if more houses were built. I strongly object to this site being proposed for development and will ensure that all other owners/occupiers of Viewpoint are aware of this proposal.
I hope that you will take my comments onboard.

Regards
Alison Arnold
Barsham and Shipmeadow Parish Council P Smith

Section Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow

Comment ID 672

Comment With reference to the above. Barsham and Shipmeadow Parish Councillors response to site reference 146 The Hill, Shipmeadow, 2.02 hectares of land which has been proposed to use as housing for an indicative 60 homes is listed below:

1. The Hamlet of Shipmeadow would be more than doubled by a development of this size
2. 60 homes would be too dense a development and would have a negative impact on the landscape of Shipmeadow
3. This would be a car dependant community requiring the use of cars for commuting to work and leisure activities. There is no bus service, no cycle track and no pedestrian footpath along the B1062 between Beccles and Bungay
4. The infrastructure of Shipmeadows waste water is at its capacity and would not cope with the volume from 60 new homes. The owner/property developer would need to address this
5. No employment
6. No local facilities
7. Danger with the extra traffic emerging from the 60 homes, exiting on the B1062 close to a corner on a fast road
8. The Parish Council is against the suggestion of this site being used for future development.
Barsham and Shipmeadow Village Hall L R Hatton

Section Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow

Comment ID 886

Comment This major development of 60 homes would double the population of Barsham and Shipmeadow. These villages have small rural communities with little in the way of amenities to support their escalating populations. There is not a pub, garage, shops, Post Office or news agent. All we have is slow broadband, poor electricity and water services, a telephone kiosk, a church and a village hall. I am chairman of the Barsham and Shipmeadow village hall and have a long and clear experience of organising facilities in the locality.

I doubt that the community could accept or accommodate such a large influx. There is no local employment and thus would bring significant increase in traffic on the B1062. All present access points to this road are narrow with poor line of sight in both directions. I have to be very careful when entering and leaving the road and have had several near misses. The planned reduction to 50 mph may help somewhat.

On a personal note I would object to having what would be a small village on the boundary of my property, which would be out of character in such an attractive agricultural environment as the Norfolk Broads.
Broads Authority Natalie Beal

Section Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow

Comment ID 850

Comment This site is on rising ground with the potential for impacts on visual amenity and landscape character (LCA2 and 3). Views across the valley are panoramic. The existing development in this area breaks the skyline. This area of land outside the Broads forms its setting for the Broads. If this site was to come forward it will have to be very carefully designed in order to mitigate likely impacts which would need to be assessed very carefully.
Christopher Arnold

Section | Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow

Comment ID | 550

Comment | This is not an appropriate site for development.
1. This is a beautiful greenfield site with outstanding views across the Waveney Valley. This would be lost if a large housing development was built.
2. This site adjoins a grade 2 listed Victorian Work house.
3. Vacant land on the edge of the Town needs to be developed first.
4. A land owner wanting to make money by selling his land is not a good reason to use it. Especially when it is highly unlikely that this development will be thoughtfully designed to seemlessly fit into the beauty of the countryside.
5. 60 houses on a small plot will be an eyesore and will clearly not seemlessly fit in.
6. I believe that the extra volume of traffic leaving onto a fast road would be a danger, especially as the access road would probably be nearer the corner and visibility of fast oncoming traffic from Beccles would be very poor. This is particularly evident leaving Viewpoint Mews. This junction is nearer Bungay and is still a dangerous exit, particularly turning right.
7. The residents of this area have worked hard to stop wind turbines being built here. This would be an even larger blot on the landscape.
Environment Agency

Section Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow

Comment ID 1170

Comment We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:
Source Protection Zone 1 and drinking water protection zone
*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Former Wangford Hundred Workhouse grade II and former Wangford Workhouse Chapel grade II to the south, Manor Farmhouse grade II and Barn grade II* to north and Church of St Bartholomew grade II* to east. Potential impact upon setting of high grade listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bumpus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>The proposal for 60 homes is completely out of scale for and must be about the existing number of dwellings in Shipmeadow Parish. The development is completely unsustainable. The Parish has no facilities is dependent on Beccles and Bungay for all its services. There is no public transport and no safe way for pedestrians alongside the B1062. The main drainage system may not be sufficient. The only way for the proposal to be even considered is for the developer to provide a shop, agree to subsidise a continuing bus service between Beccles and Bungay and meet the cost of any upgrade to utilities. Even then, it will completely change the character of the parish and its benefits must be doubtful when compared to developments elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phil Starling

Section Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow

Comment ID 499

Comment With regards the above site 146. The site of Shipmeadow workhouse is a site of national historical importance. The buildings are all grade 2 listed and any new development in this area would seriously detract from the character, presence and integrity of the site. Additionally the sewerage and drainage from the workhouse site runs through the middle of this field and if compromised will lead to serious issues for all residents.

As an owner of a property here I specifically chose this site for its Georgian listed status, privacy, originality and green belt status with its fantastic views across the Waveney valley. Any new development would impact extremely negatively on the listed status of the area, the natural beauty of the area and additionally on the wildlife presence here (owls, bats) not to mention possible compromisation of services and access issues. It would also impact negatively on property values and as such I would like to register my STRONG OBJECTIONS to any consideration of development here.

I am sure there are far more suitable sites to consider without destroying a beautiful historical area with conflicting building types and impacting on the environment and wildlife.

Mr P Starling,
16 Viewpoint Mews,
Shipmeadow,
NR34 8EX.
Samantha Kent

Section Potential land for development 146 - The Hill, Shipmeadow

Comment ID 643

Comment The land is completely inappropriate for building. It’s situation is in the beautiful waveney Valley. It’s located on the same site as a grade 2 listed building that’s 250 years old. New builds would not be in keeping at all. The building itself is named viewpoint which it wouldn’t be with new houses built. The proposed build would have a serious negative effect on property prices as the views, quiet and natural beauty is it selling point. Owners would live in a town if they wanted hundreds of neighbours. The land has drainage running underneath also. The beauty and tranquillity of the countryside should remain just that and not spoiled by noise and an eyesore of a modern housing estate. There are far more appropriate sites that are within built up areas, with amenities close by. This site would pose serious problems for a car less family and there isn’t a bus service. The field itself is also a haven for wildlife, seeing numerous bees, birds and bats upon an evening.
Potential land for development 147 - The Old Rifle Range, A12 London Road, Gisleham

Bruce Provan

Section | Potential land for development 147 - The Old Rifle Range, A12 London Road, Gisleham

Comment ID | 533

Comment | It is crucial to keep the buffer between Lowestoft and Kessingland.
Environment Agency

Section | Potential land for development 147 - The Old Rifle Range, A12 London Road, Gisleham

Comment ID | 1144

Comment | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:
Partly in Flood Zone 2 and 3

*Flood Zone – A floodplain is the area that would naturally be affected by flooding if a river rises above its banks, or high tides and stormy seas cause flooding in coastal areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norman Castleton</td>
<td>Potential land for development 147 - The Old</td>
<td>This is an open coastal area and adjacent to the Heritage Coast. Totally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rifle Range, A12 London Road, Gisleham</td>
<td>inappropriate to build on this land and it should be opened up to be a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wildlife site for coastal flora and fauna. A vital gap between Pakefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Kessingland. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section  Potential land for development 147 - The Old Rifle Range, A12 London Road, Gisleham

Comment ID  720

Comment  Site 147 appears to partly include Pakefield Cliffs County Wildlife Site (CWS) and, based on aerial photographs, may also contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that this site should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on either the CWS or any existing ecological value that the site has.
Tegerdine
Ingleton Wood LLP (Sarah Hornbrook)

Section
Potential land for development 147 - The Old Rifle Range, A12 London Road, Gisleham

Comment ID
613

Comment
On behalf of Martin and Lawrence Tegerdine, we wish to support the development of Site 147 for housing and associated purposes. We have reviewed the Initial Sustainability Appraisal of the Emerging Site Options, and consider that site 147 represents a sustainable and deliverable site, capable of accommodating a significant quantum of the planned growth for Lowestoft, whilst also providing an opportunity to create an attractive, defensible southern boundary to the town through a well-designed Sustainable Urban Extension.

The site would represent a logical and sustainable extension to the settlement at the southern edge of Lowestoft/Pakefield, particularly if allocated in conjunction with site 22 to the north. A comprehensive Masterplan for the sites would facilitate the creation of a Sustainable Urban Extension in this location, which would not only provide much-needed housing, but also make provision for community facilities and other infrastructure, whilst providing a natural and defensible southern boundary to the town in the longer term.

At present, the southern edge of Lowestoft in this location is poorly defined, and unattractive. Development of the northern-eastern quadrant of site 147, together with site 22, for housing would provide an opportunity, through a comprehensive landscaping scheme, to create a clear buffer and a defined edge to the settlement. If built development is concentrated at the northern end of the site, the southern and western parts could provide a significant area of open space, which would not only provide a community asset, but also an opportunity to enhance the appearance of the town and create an attractive entrance to Lowestoft from the south when travelling along the A12.

At present, there is an undeveloped stretch of frontage to the east of the A12, between the southern edge of Beach Farm Residential and Holiday Park, and the northern edge of the row of cottages known as Catherine Terrace, Elizabeth Terrace and Barnard's Terrace, which measures less than 200m. However, whilst undeveloped, this stretch of the A12 does not have a rural or remote character and appearance; when travelling northwards on the A12, there is a clear change in character from more rural to urban and...
developed, which occurs at the Morrisons Roundabout, opposite Catherine, Elizabeth and Barnard’s Terrace. On the western side of the A12 is an existing industrial area, and a more recent retail area. In addition, planning application DC/15/5066/FUL was granted a resolution to approve in April 2016, for 4 additional retail units, a café and a flexible retail/restaurant unit at the junction of Tower Road with the A12, to the immediate north-west of the site. If built, this will further alter the environs of the site, emphasising the urban and developed nature of this part of Lowestoft. Residential development of the northern part of site 147, and site 22, would balance this development on the opposite site of the A12, and provide an opportunity to ‘round off’ the southern edge of the town in an attractive, robust and defensible way.

As described above, in order to overcome any concerns regarding landscape impact and the loss of the undeveloped gap (designated in the Adopted Local Plan as a Strategic Gap) between Pakefield and Kessingland, it is suggested that development of site 147 could be concentrated at the northern end of the site, with the triangular section at the southern end being used for open space and therefore continuing to fulfil the function of the Strategic Gap. This approach would result in the loss of a stretch of approx. 300-400m of the Strategic Gap, but in reality this area of land makes only a minimal contribution to the function of the Gap at present. From the A12, glimpses through to the coast are at best extremely limited, and are mostly obscured by Pakefield Caravan Park, and the row of cottages known as Catherine Terrace, Elizabeth Terrace and Barnard’s Terrace.

The northern edge of Kessingland is very clearly defined, with a very distinct east-west boundary between the countryside and the settlement. With the exception of site 85, a relatively small 2.66ha site, landowners have not suggested any significant expansion of the town in this location, and it can therefore be assumed that this edge of the Strategic Gap will remain largely unchanged. On this basis, a Strategic Gap of between 2 and 2.5km could still be retained between the southern edge of Pakefield, and the northern edge of Kessingland, which is more than sufficient to ensure that the function of the Strategic Gap, as defined in Policy DM28 of the Adopted Development Plan, continues to be fulfilled. Concentration of any development within site 147 in the north-eastern quadrant will also assist in ensuring that the undeveloped stretches of coastline remain unaltered. Residential development of the northern part of site 147 would be well-contained in landscape terms, and, subject to a comprehensive landscaping scheme, would have minimal impact from public viewpoints. Development would be kept away from the cliffs and the County Wildlife Site, in order to address concerns regarding coastal erosion and impact on
ecology/biodiversity. This would also limit views of the development from the beach. Restriction of development to the northern and western parts of the site, could be secured through either a Development Brief or Masterplan for the site, specifying the extent of built development, and identifying the parts of the site to remain undeveloped.

In terms of accessibility and sustainability, there is an existing footway on the eastern side of the A12 which allows pedestrian and cycle access into Pakefield. The site is well-served by public transport, with regular services to Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth to the north and Kessingland and Southwold to the south, running along the A12. The site is well-located in relation to the existing Primary School in Pakefield, and the new High School which is currently under construction on London Road, approximately 500m to the north of the site. The proposed retail units to the north-west of the site, for which a resolution to approve has been granted, and the existing retail units further south, are readily accessible by foot or by cycle, as are the employment areas to the west.

Contributions to community infrastructure could be secured either through CIL payments, or through on-site provision. Allocation of the site, in conjunction with site 22 of the north, would enable a comprehensive masterplan to be drawn up for a Sustainable Urban Extension to the south of Pakefield, which would consider the provision of all types of infrastructure.

Whilst the site is currently undeveloped Greenfield land, it has not been in productive agricultural use nor used for grazing, since 1912 when it was first used by the Ministry of Defence as a military rifle range. Its loss for housing development would therefore have a far less significant impact than the loss of other sites on the edge of Lowestoft that are currently in productive agricultural use. Indeed, development of the site represents an opportunity to bring the site into productive use, which is not likely to occur otherwise; the nature of the site's previous uses does not make it desirable for either agriculture or grazing. The size of the site is such that it would be capable of delivering a quantum of development that is capable of making a significant contribution towards the Council's required housing numbers, and would in turn reduce pressure on the Council to release more sensitive sites for housing.

The site is deliverable, as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is available now, and as described above offers a suitable location for development now. Development of the site would be viable, and housing could be brought forward within the next 5 years.

In conclusion, it is considered that development of the north-eastern quadrant of site 147 could provide a considerable quantum of the new
homes planned for the District and more specifically Lowestoft, in a sustainable location that is well-related to existing and proposed services and infrastructure and which provides an excellent opportunity to create an attractive entrance into Lowestoft from the south, with a clear and defensible southern boundary to the town. Development of the site would not undermine the function of the Strategic Gap between Pakefield and Kessingland, and the site is capable of providing a significant area of public open space, to the benefit of the wider community, and meeting infrastructure needs either on-site or through financial contributions.
Section Potential land for development 147 - The Old Rifle Range, A12 London Road, Gisleham

Comment ID 198

Comment As a long-term resident of the Waveney area, please find below my thoughts/comments on three of the proposed blocks of land:
Site 22 (117 proposed dwellings) – Hammonds Farm
Site 147 (473 proposed dwellings) – Old Rifle Range
Site 98 (54 proposed dwellings) – Rear of Elizabeth Terrace

These three sites provide a fabulous opportunity for different types of housing in South Lowestoft. Each block of land could provide a specific type of housing to meet different needs, and together they would form a diverse development that accommodates residents of all ages. The three sites could be developed as follows:
Site 22 – Affordable rented 1-2 bed apartments
Site 147 – Affordable rented 2-3 bed houses
Site 98 – Affordable rented 1-2 bed retirement accommodation (flats/bungalows)

Sites 22, 147 and 98 are also ideally placed to service this diverse range of residents, and the surrounding amenities would fulfil their requirements and provide a greater quality of life:
1. Close to schools for those with children
2. Close to shops (literally over the road, so can leave car at home and reduce carbon footprint)
3. On main bus route – Lowestoft to the north, and Kessingland/Southwold to the south
4. Close to the beach. This provides a free 'day out' for those with young children, and a pleasant walk in the fresh air for older residents. Many elderly people have mobility issues, and the proximity of the beach to the three sites makes it feasible in terms of exercise and enjoying the natural environment.

This site could also provide an opportunity to provide a new type of private 'rented' property to the residents of Waveney. A large percentage of the population are now priced out of the housing market, and according to The Guardian, 'by 2025, more than half those under 40 will be living in properties owned by private landlords' (2015, see link below).
http://www.theguardian.com/money/2015/jul/22/pwc-report-generation-rent-to-grow-over-next-decade
Unfortunately, many of these people are not only priced out of the housing market, but are also ineligible for Social Housing. This leaves them in a 'no mans land' of private rentals, with little long-term security based on the current practice of 'two months notice' within their tenancy agreements. Could Waveney provide quality and affordable 'private' rental properties that give greater security to tenants? After an initial six months probation within the property, could a longer lease period be agreed between tenant and landlord (say 5-10 years) as they do in continental Europe? This would be beneficial on several levels:

• Landlords have the security of knowing they have a quality tenant in their property
• Tenants have the security of knowing they are not permanently on 'two months notice' within the property.
  (This also encourages investment in the property by the tenant (new carpets, decoration etc), that they may not feel committed to make on a short term notice lease)
• Tenants looking to rent for a fixed term (5-10 years) could use that period in an 'affordable' rented property to save up for a deposit on a place of their own. If they subsequently become part of a couple, then a double income can assist in this process

All of the above contributes to a greater harmony in the landlord/tenant relationship, and provides stable and realistic housing opportunities for the residents of Waveney.

I believe that these three sites have fabulous housing potential within the Lowestoft area, and provide a very good quality of life for the future residents who live there.
Potential land for development 148 - The Sawmill, Sandy Lane, Holton

Anonymous

Section  
Potential land for development 148 - The Sawmill, Sandy Lane, Holton

Comment ID  
175

Comment  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**        | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:  
Source Protection Zone 2  
*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).  
Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section  
Potential land for development 148 - The Sawmill, Sandy Lane, Holton

Comment ID  
831

Comment  
Similarly, Sites 73 and 121,103, 148 are classified as Holton and HTC and Holton would need to look at this together.
| **Halesworth Town Council N Rees** |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| **Section**      | Potential land for development 148 - The Sawmill, Sandy Lane, Holton |
| **Comment ID**   | 845                              |
| **Comment**      | Sites 32, 103 and 148 are Holton. |
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section                  Potential land for development 148 - The Sawmill, Sandy Lane, Holton

Comment ID              1093

Comment                 Adjacent to Holton Conservation Area. Also proximity to Montagu Cottage, K6 Telephone Kiosk, Holton Mill (post windmill) and Millside and Myrtle Cottage, all grade II listed. Potential impact upon setting of listed buildings and Conservation Area.
Jeffrey P Geering

Section
Potential land for development 148 - The Sawmill, Sandy Lane, Holton

Comment ID: 72

Comment: The current volume of housing shown for this site is 5 (five). Please amend with a number that would be indicative of a site this size, similar sites of a similar size in the local area would suggest a number between 45-55. Notwithstanding the final development use is open to discussion and as the owner I would welcome feedback from the planning office and any other interested parties.

regards,
J P Geering
Potential land for development 148 - The Sawmill, Sandy Lane, Holton

Comment ID: 1241

Comment:
On behalf of Mr J Geering, we wish to support the allocation of site 148 for residential use, to deliver approximately 20 dwellings.
In accordance with the NPPF, the site is deliverable, inasmuch as it represents a suitable location for development, is available immediately and would be viable.

Suitability
The site is located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Holton, in easy walking distance of the village’s primary school and other facilities. Holton is categorised in the Adopted Local Plan as a larger village, which recognises the presence of a range of services in the village. In addition, it is close to the market town of Halesworth. As such, it represents a sustainable location for development, and a modest level of growth will ensure the future vitality of the village, helping to sustain the local services and facilities. At present, the village pub is closed, although it continues to offer Bed & Breakfast accommodation; an appropriate scale injection of new households into the village may act as the catalyst for the re-opening of this important community facility.

The site constitutes Previously Developed Land, having been used as a sawmill for some 200 years, with current consent for storage and distribution, with an element of ancillary retail use, secured under planning permission reference DC/10/1572/FUL. Development of this site would, therefore, be preferable to the release of Greenfield land elsewhere around the village, and would be in line with the NPPF, and Core Strategy policy CS01, which seek to ensure that Previously Developed Land is brought forward in preference to Greenfield sites. Development in this location would protect the important and more sensitive areas of undeveloped land around the village from pressures to accommodate housing. It should be noted that the Initial Sustainability Appraisal of the Emerging Site Options, incorrectly identifies the site as Grade 3 Agricultural Land at point 11 of the matrix; this directly contradicts the comment at point 14 which states that development of the site would result in the loss of the site from employment use. As previously described, the site has not been in agricultural use for at least 200 years; this is widely acknowledged by the Council, for instance in the Committee Report for application.
DC/15/0871/FUL which describes the site at paragraph 2.1 as a "long standing commercial site". Whilst the site is, technically, an 'employment site' it is not currently in use, and although the consent for storage and distribution is extant, the building works have not been completed, and this use has not been brought into place. Consequently, its loss from an employment use would not have any negative impacts.

In contrast to many of the other sites put forward through the 'Call for Sites', the site would not result in the coalescence of Holton and Halesworth, and would not have significant landscape impact, being relatively well-contained and screened within the wider landscape. As such, it represents a more suitable location for growth of the village. Sites 65 and 87 are both located within the identified Strategic Gap between Holton and Halesworth, which the 2015 Green Infrastructure Strategy identifies as important to the character of both communities, and states should be protected.

Whilst the site is located immediately adjacent to the Holton Conservation Area, sensitive development of the site would ensure no adverse impact on the Conservation Area, including views into and out of it.

The site is adjacent to the Holton Pit SSSI, which is designated for its geological significance, specifically the exposed sediment sequence. In accordance with Natural England's views on management of the SSSI, development at the site would not result in concealment of the features of interest, i.e. the exposed rock face, and would therefore have no adverse impact on the SSSI. In addition, a County Wildlife Site is located to the east; sensitive development of the site can help to ensure that there is no adverse impact on this site.

Availability
The site would be available for development immediately, and it is envisaged that housing could be delivered within 3-5 years. The site is within single ownership, and the owner is willing to release it for development without delay.

Viability
Development of the site for residential purposes would be viable, taking into consideration the policy requirements in relation to matters such as affordable housing provision and CIL contributions.

Conclusion
As outlined above, the site is suitable, available and viable, and can therefore be considered deliverable, in accordance with the NPPF definition, and the use of the site to deliver approximately 20 dwellings would represent sustainable development. Environmentally, the site is the least sensitive of those put forward on the fringes of Holton, being located
away from the Strategic Gap between Holton and Halesworth, on previously developed land, which is well-contained in landscape terms. Local services, including a primary school, are easily accessible on foot, and there are good public transport links. Economically, development of the site would put an under-utilised brownfield site back into productive use, and would bring benefits to the local economy, helping to sustain and bolster local services and facilities in the village. Socially, development for housing would not only provide much-needed accommodation for local people, it would also deliver a policy-compliant level of affordable housing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Lavery</td>
<td>Potential land for development 148 - The Sawmill, Sandy Lane, Holton</td>
<td>Why not leave this in its traditional use as an area for light industry, instead of cramming in housing/ care homes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section
Potential land for development 148 - The Sawmill, Sandy Lane, Holton

Comment ID 813

Comment
It is difficult to see how this site could be developed as the access is very restricted. The area is part of a natural open space in Holton.
Potential land for development 149 - The Street, St Margaret South Elmham

Anonymous

Section  Potential land for development 149 - The Street, St Margaret South Elmham

Comment ID  1136

Comment  I would like to bring to the attention to the planning dept. that this small quiet village has no school, no shops, no doctors surgery, no leisure facilities, few if any local jobs and a road network which is only fit for horse and carts, surely therefore it would be logical to build new houses close to places where these amenities already exist and a road network which can cope with the extra traffic. I also like many others can see the decline in wildlife in general, and development in rural areas in my opinion will only add to this decline. I just hope if permission is given it does not open the flood gates for more of the same.
Flixton, St Cross & St Margaret South Elmham Grouped Parish Council Sara Mulhearn

Section
Potential land for development 149 - The Street, St Margaret South Elmham

Comment ID
950

Comment
Context of this response
This response is informed by the views of local residents who attended an Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting on 6th July 2016. Over 40 people were there out of a village total population of approximately 100 and written contributions were also received. This level of participation reflects the strength of the community and the feeling about local developments. The meeting was audio recorded. At the start an email from District Councillor David Ritchie was read saying there was no likelihood of large scale development in the villages in this area due to lack of services. Robert Walpole, the landowner who had put forward the site, also made a statement confirming he did not want or suggest 57 houses and had anticipated a very much smaller number. Nor had he been consulted or aware of the figure of 57 before publication. He stated he would not sell the land for a large scale development. An email from a resident was read out strongly opposing the suggestion of mass development in the village with detailed reasons. This email summed up the feelings of many and is reproduced below for information. There was then a lively and open discussion regarding the scale, nature, need for, history, location, environmental aspects, implications of access across common land, costs, and concerns regarding any new houses which would be considered appropriate and proportionate. Without exception the speakers alluded to the wonderful spirit and the special and highly valued sense of community and cohesion in this village which they feel is important to maintain. At the end of the meeting there was no official vote but a show of hands was taken about the preferences of residents which has informed the Parish Council response below.

Based on the outcome of local consultation, the response of the Grouped Parish Council to the suggestion of housing development in St Margaret South Elmham on site 149 is:

1) The majority of residents of St Margaret South Elmham are prepared to consider some small scale housing development provided it was sympathetic to the environment and in proportion with the size and spirit of the village. It is recognised that some appropriate development in keeping with local needs and circumstances could enrich the community
and affordable houses in particular could enable local people to stay in the area. However, any developments should be gradual and incremental, carefully considered and the residents should be consulted at all stages. Where possible new houses should be on small infill sites where new residents could be more easily absorbed into the village to the benefit of all concerned. In addition there may be alternative sites within the village which could be considered for small scale housing instead of site 149.

2) However, the Grouped Parish Council and local residents are unanimously and totally opposed to large scale development in St Margaret South Elmham. It is obviously unrealistic, unsustainable and disproportionate in a small remote village. There are clearly inadequate services of all kinds to meet the needs of a high number of new residents with the sewerage being a particular concern as this village is not on mains drainage and there are already problems regarding drainage on this site. The cost to Waveney District Council for providing these services to the required standard would be exorbitant. Access to any new development in the village would be across common land which brings significant issues about permissions especially on a large scale. The suggested number of 57 houses would more than double the village and would be completely out of scale and out of keeping with the environment, and the spirit and character of the area. The many reasons why a large development would be so inappropriate are summarised in detail at the end of this letter.

3) Some residents do not want any new development at all in the village because they feel it would be detrimental to the overall local environment and too remote for new housing. It was pointed out that some years ago this village had been designated by Waveney District Council to be a 'dead village' where no new development would be possible.

4) We recognise that this local consultation is part of a much larger process and that there is a need for more housing in Waveney. However we consider that the right place for mass development is in the towns because of the much greater access to essential services.

Comments on the process of consultation
We consider that the process of publishing a potential number of houses for sites according to a blanket formula and without knowledge of the landowner or others is insensitive and could be damaging to both local relationships and to the planning process overall. For St Margaret South Elmham the figure of 57 was given a) without paying any apparent regard to the potential impact on the village, the residents and the environment b) without supporting evidence that large scale development could be possible or sustainable on the site and c) without the knowledge of the landowner. This could have caused significant discord and divisions.
between local residents for instance if people believed that the landowner supported the idea of 57 houses. It could also have been self defeating to the aims of WDC by creating conditions which then spoiled the chances of finding sites which are suitable and acceptable for development in the village and surrounding area. We hope very much that in future Waveney District Council will consider a consultation process, at whatever stage, which respects local people and local impact and need.

We hope these views from the Grouped Parish Council will contribute to the development of the final New Waveney Local Plan.

Appendix
The email from a resident of St Margaret South Elmham which sums up the reasons for opposing large scale development in the village. See above

The proposals of Waveney DC are indiscriminate and unrealistic- they do not address the actual housing need in the area, have no regard for the impact on the village nor the consequences for the infrastructure of the area generally.

1 LOCATION : St Margaret’s is a totally inappropriate location for mass housing; it
1.1 is remote from centres of employment
1.2 is remote from essential services - schools, medical centres, leisure facilities
1.3 has no public transport and poor bus and train transport services from nearby towns
1.4 is accessed by only small local roads/lanes which only meet the present needs and are prone to flooding
1.5 has an under-developed infrastructure eg no gas, no mains drainage, no street lighting or paving
1.6 access to any new development would be across common land which would bring difficulties re permission especially on a large scale

2 DEVELOPMENT: It is unrealistic to propose a development on a scale that would more than double the size of the village:
2.1 it would totally change the character and cohesion of the village,
2.2 it takes no account of the impact on existing services which are already fragile for example electricity (overhead supply) and water supply
2.3 it would significantly add to problems of surface drainage with a potentially increased risk of flooding
2.4 there is no evidence of significant demand for a major housing scheme in the locality and therefore the development may not achieve the Council’s objective with the consequent possibility of creating second homes

NB The village has long been considered by Waveney DC to be at the limit of its sustainable size and even small developments have been rejected on
these grounds - these earlier reservations are still valid.

3 SPECIFIC SITE PROBLEMS

3.1 Drainage is already a serious problem on this field (the reason given for it not being cropped). Water run-off would be immeasurably worsened by building, especially dense occupancy. Existing ditches were made to deal with field drainage and already flood from time to time impeding road access - they would not cope with the additional run-off caused by buildings. The site would therefore require special drainage measures to cope with additional water usage and to direct run-off to suitable water courses to avoid the risk of flooding. (It is unclear where the excess water might have to go.)

3.2 It would need either a substantial sewage treatment plant or mains drainage for the village

3.3 electricity and water supply would have to be upgraded - probably for the whole village

3.4 there is no gas

3.5 with an increase in population there would be a need to provide open spaces/ play areas

4 COST : it should be acknowledged that the cost of essential infrastructure improvement beyond the environs of the site itself (eg drainage or village access roads) would fall on Waveney DC and not the developer

5 GENERAL COMMENT

It is disappointing that Waveney DC have not conducted this search for building land through parish councils who would have brought local knowledge to bear in what could be considered practicable and take account of the local housing needs. The approach taken by Waveney makes a nonsense of the planning process and is unlikely to fulfil the goal of building much-needed housing because it will have spoiled the chances of finding more sensible small scale developments that are more achievable in rural locations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 149 - The Street, St Margaret South Elmham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to Greenside Farmhouse to south west and Post Office Stores Thimble Cottage to north west, both grade II listed and scheduled Monument Moated site to east. Potential impact on setting of listed buildings and on Scheduled Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Riseborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 149 - The Street, St Margaret South Elmham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>The amount of houses submitted for this piece of land would double the size of this very small village. Also there is no sewerage system and at present all effluent goes into the ditch at the back of the present houses and is supposed to drain away. In practice this does not happen and we have to dig the ditch out ourselves every other year as this ditch is on our farmland. Otherwise this creates a problem with rats. If more houses were built here in this village, a proper sewage system would have to be installed. A small number of houses on this site (maybe up to 10) would be more appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kathryn Savage

Section: Potential land for development 149 - The Street, St Margaret South Elmham

Comment ID: 270

Comment: St Margaret South Elmham is a small village with 29 residential properties in the village itself at present, and approximately only 41 in the whole of the parish. We are told that this potential land for development would be for 57 properties - more than doubling the entire parish properties. The population here is mainly of the older generations, enjoying a peaceful later life way of living.

If we take as an example 2 adults in each proposed new home, the new development would more than double the existing adult population. The new development would similarly produce as many more cars in the village as the number of homes provided, and likely even more. There is no public transport from this village, so cars, bikes etc are a must. The roads around the village on all sides, are not well-built, narrow, and frequently need attention. These would need to be upgraded. This also would increase greatly with double the number of vehicles attached to the development.

Further, there is also no mains drainage/sewerage in the village at all. All properties are serviced by septic tanks. The row of eight cottages where I live uses a very large septic tank servicing the row of eight - how might drainage/sewerage be considered on a plot with 57 properties?

There is no mains gas provision in the village. Homes with gas appliances have to use caller gas tanks. Most others are all electric.

All in all, it seems to me, as a former Clerk to the Parish Council, without bias, that this proposal is a no-brainer, given the enormous amount of infrastructure that would be needed to service and maintain the development.
L Blaxland

Section  Potential land for development 149 - The Street, St Margaret South Elmham

Comment ID  939

Comment  I have just heard of the plan to put fifty six extra houses in the village.
I would like to object in the strongest possible terms.
There are only 35 houses at present – no main drainage or other facilities –
shops – buses, lighting.
Please do not spoil the well loved and tended small communities which
remain in this area.
I can assure you we value them very highly.
Valerie Smith

Section Potential land for development 149 - The Street, St Margaret South Elmham

Comment ID 372

Comment The proposals of Waveney DC are indiscriminate and unrealistic - they do not address the actual housing need in the area, have no regard for the impact on the village nor the consequences for the infrastructure of the area generally.

1 LOCATION : St Margaret’s is a totally inappropriate location for mass housing; it
1.1 is remote from centres of employment
1.2 is remote from essential services - schools, medical centres, leisure facilities
1.3 has no public transport and poor bus and train transport services from nearby towns
1.4 is accessed by only small local roads/lanes which only meet the present needs and are prone to flooding
1.5 has an under-developed infrastructure eg no gas, no mains drainage, no street lighting or paving

2 DEVELOPMENT: It is unrealistic to propose a development on a scale that would more than double the size of the village:
2.1 it would totally change the character and cohesion of the village,
2.2 it takes no account of the impact on existing services which are already fragile for example electricity (overhead supply) and water supply
2.3 it would significantly add to problems of surface drainage with a potentially increased risk of flooding
2.4 there is no evidence of significant demand for a major housing scheme in the locality and therefore the development may not achieve the Council’s objective with the consequent possibility of creating second homes

NB The village has long been considered by Waveney DC to be at the limit of its sustainable size and even small developments have been rejected on these grounds - these earlier reservations are still valid.

3 SPECIFIC SITE PROBLEMS
3.1 Drainage is already a serious problem on this field (the reason given for it not being cropped). Water run-off would be immeasurably worsened by building, especially dense occupancy. Existing ditches were made to deal with field drainage and already flood from time to time impeding road access - they would not cope with the additional run-off caused by
buildings. The site would therefore require special drainage measures to cope with additional water usage and to direct run-off to suitable water courses to avoid the risk of flooding. (It is unclear where the excess water might have to go.)

3.2 it would need either a substantial sewage treatment plant or mains drainage for the village

3.3 electricity and water supply would have to be upgraded - probably for the whole village

3.4 there is no gas

3.5 with an increase in population there would be a need to provide open spaces/ play areas

4 COST: it should be acknowledged that the cost of essential infrastructure improvement beyond the environs of the site itself (eg drainage or village access roads) would fall on Waveney DC and not the developer

5 GENERAL COMMENT

It is unfortunate that the consultation does not start from the question of what the needs are rather than what sites are available for building and has not given local communities enough time to take on board the need to consider the true needs for the village. The approach direct to landowners has produced only interest from those with pecuniary interests rather than a comprehensive consideration by local people. Our parish council has sadly not attended to the need to look at local planning and I fear that being presented with a part of the plan that is unsuitable will only serve to provoke rejection of all possible development.
Potential land for development 150 - The Street, St James South Elmham

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 150 - The Street, St James South Elmham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Abbey Farmhouse and Barn, The Thatched Cottage, Brook Cottages, all grade II listed. Potential impact upon setting of listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Janet Holden

SectionPotential land for development 150 - The Street, St James South Elmham

Comment ID86

CommentSt James South Elmham does not have the infrastructure to increase in size, there are no buses or transport that runs on a regular basis, the nearest schools are a distance away for both primary and secondary pupils. I am concerned that increasing the size of the village, where we don't have mains drainage, where power supply is often interrupted and where residents had to pay for BT to install superfast broadband will add further pressure to an overstretched infrastructure. The development will increase traffic through the village on roads that are falling apart and poorly maintained. The fact that there is no public transport and that new developments often are occupied by families with children will mean that school run traffic will cause significant road safety concerns to pedestrians especially because there are no pavements through the village and the road is already heavily used by agricultural vehicles. In addition there are no facilities in the village, no shop no pub, no opportunities for young people’s leisure, which means that the development will just result in people simply living in the location with no opportunity to support and build the community. 93 homes will double the size of the village, will detract from the historical ribbon structure of the village, spoil the uninterrupted views across a unique and significant landscape and have a detrimental effect on wildlife in the area which is home to barn owls, larger mammals and important colonies of amphibians. Additionally the roads in and out of the village are very narrow with no passing places and the nearest shops are either in Bungay or Halesworth over 6 miles away. The proposed land is arable land adjacent to pig farms which Im sure new residents will not appreciate. Finally this is a rural area and filling the area with high density suburban housing will ruin the look and feel of the surroundings and I believe that such a development does not fit in with Waveney councils current planning guidance.
Michael Fontenoy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 150 - The Street, St James South Elmham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

St James is a village with poor transport links, it has been said that you find it when you are lost. It is a mainly agricultural village still and therefore has lots of large agricultural vehicular movements on lanes which they just fit into. Public transport is non existent, a community transport bus provides a service to a different town once each day and is no use for commuting. There are no schools, shops, pubs or other typical infrastructure all meaning that everyone in the village drives somewhere to do anything. Those who do not or cannot drive are trapped.

Superfast Broadband only came to the village because people in the village paid for the connections instead of waiting years. Power is not assured with regular outages in winter, and low amperage is a occurrence. Low water pressure is another factor to take consideration.

The number of houses suggested for the sites in St James would double the size of the village and the council will need to seriously consider how to overcome elements described b.

The existing housing stock is not densely situated and the number of houses would change the character of the village.
On behalf of my sisters and myself, I submitted a proposal for two areas of potential development land in St James South Elmham, sites referenced as 143 and 150 in your consultation document. We were rather surprised to see in your document that these have been identified as having possible room for 33 and 93 houses respectively, including a care home on the latter site.

We recognise that these housing figures are based on the standard densities you use for calculating a site's potential, but obviously in a small village such as St James, housing groupings of this size would create an over-dominant development. If these areas are included in your final plan we would therefore seek to work with Waveney Planning Department to create a development suitable for the village.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 150 - The Street, St James South Elmham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>St James South Elmham Parish Meeting Mary Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Help Plan Our Future booklet shows (p 53) that two sites in St James South Elmham have been put forward by a developer/landowner as having potential for housing development and being suitable for inclusion in the local plan. We have the following comments about these two sites:

1. The maps show two large areas fronting The Street and St James Lane with capacity for 93 and 33 homes respectively – 126 in total. Having spoken to the landowner, the origin of these numbers is unknown, and it is not believed they formed part of the proposition made in response to this consultation. It is thought they were added by WDC.

2. As noted above, the village currently has 88 homes. This development would increase the size of the village by about 150%. We believe this is wholly disproportionate to the size of the village.

3. The development would also represent 50 times as many houses as would be a proportionate increase for the village under the scenario examined under Q7 above and be inconsistent with a housing strategy based on that approach.

4. It would imply a population rise from 205 to almost 500 and be significantly beyond the available infrastructure’s ability to cope and beyond the scope of the current amenities. The communal village facilities are limited to a hall, a church, a village orchard and small wood.

5. The village is agricultural at heart and set in a deeply rural area. There is no likelihood of local employment needs generating housing demand of this scale.

6. The nature of the village is reflected in its structure and character, with agriculture coming right into the heart of the village. Development on this scale and on these sites would remove that distinctive feature and destroy the nature and cohesion of the community.

7. We do believe that some small growth in housing in the village, fitting with its size and character, on appropriate sites, and consistent with the rural area percentage as noted in Q7, above, could be considered.

In summary, the proposed St James developments are inappropriate sites, massively disproportionate in scale, unnecessary in the context of any of the Waveney development scenarios, unsustainable by the existing infrastructure, and damaging to the structure, style and character of the village. Small levels of additional development (up to 1 – 2 homes per year)
might be sustainable and useful. I hope these comments and observations will be useful. Should you have any questions about the content of this response do not hesitate to contact me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 151 - Town Farm 1, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section: Potential land for development 151 - Town Farm 1, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID: 524

Comment: The land is not suitable for development for the following reasons:
- It is productive agricultural land.
- The land is remote from the town centre and residential development would exacerbate car journeys.
- It forms part of the Strategic Gap (Policy DM 28 Adopted January 2011) and Open Breaks to prevent coalescence of Halesworth and Holton and maintain the character of fields and ancient hedgerows that separate the two settlements.
- The land is only accessible from Harrison's Lane - an attractive but narrow country lane with poor connection to the primary road network and unsuited to increased traffic.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section: Potential land for development 151 - Town Farm 1, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID: 1198

Comment: The sites further north 106,140,141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town. There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
G H Thomas

Section: Potential land for development 151 - Town Farm 1, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID: 21

Comment: This comment doesn't just apply to the site 151. It includes 65/152/153/154/155/161. All these sites are adjacent to one another and if they are all given the go ahead to build the housing units they have asked for that will mean 525 new homes in that one very large zone. At an average of two people per unit means 1,050 people. That on its own causes a problem with road congestion but also potential need for more schools and another doctors surgery, let alone more shops and other facilities. If that is then put with site 102 which is designated for business, this may have the benefit of creating employment for the area, but again congestion on the roads.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 151 - Town Farm 1, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The sites adjacent to 161 - 151, 152, 153 should be considered as potentially adding to a sport/ recreational facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 151 - Town Farm 1, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to Town Farmhouse, grade II listed building to south. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 151 - Town Farm 1, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This should be designated as aspirational sport and recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tony Langford

Section | Potential land for development 151 - Town Farm 1, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID | 38

Comment | If more housing than that provided by the 'Tesco Site' on Saxons Way and the Halesworth Campus/Cutlers Hill/Patrick Stead proposed development is needed this is probably one of the better sites in Halesworth but is it too far from town encouraging more traffic.
Potential land for development 152 - Town Farm 2, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth / Holton

Anonymous

Section
Potential land for development 152 - Town Farm 2, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth / Holton

Comment ID
178

Comment
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section Potential land for development 152 - Town Farm 2, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth / Holton

Comment ID 523

Comment This land is not suitable for development for the following reasons:-
* It is productive agricultural land.
* The land is remote from the town centre and residential development would exacerbate car journeys.
* It forms part of the Strategic Gap (Policy DM 28 Adopted January 2011) and Open Breaks to prevent coalescence of Halesworth and Holton and maintain the character of fields and ancient hedgerows that separate the two settlements.
* The land adjoins or includes the distinctive landscape feature of a 'green lane' or 'loke' with high amenity value and much used and appreciated which should be conserved.
* The land is only accessible from Harrison's Lane - an attractive but narrow country lane with poor connection to the primary road network and unsuited to increased traffic.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section Potential land for development 152 - Town Farm 2, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth / Holton

Comment ID 1199

Comment The sites further north 106,140,141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town. There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 152 - Town Farm 2, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth / Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The sites adjacent to 161 - 151, 152, 153 should be considered as potentially adding to a sport/ recreational facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Halesworth Town Council N Rees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 152 - Town Farm 2, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth / Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 152 is on the border of Holton and Halesworth. 165 houses are far too many as proposal in this area and potentially encroach on the strategic gap.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  
Potential land for development 152 - Town Farm 2, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth / Holton

Comment ID  
1099

Comment  
Proximity to Town Farmhouse, grade II listed building to south. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Building.
## The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

### Section
Potential land for development 152 - Town Farm 2, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth / Holton

### Comment ID
815

### Comment
The western part should be designated as aspirational sport and recreation facilities and the eastern part designated to preserve the non-housing strategic gap between Halesworth and Holton as in the WDC Green Infrastructure Strategy document 2015.
Tony Langford

Section
Potential land for development 152 - Town Farm 2, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth / Holton

Comment ID
39

Comment
Should not be considered for development as will impact on the strategic gap between Halesworth & Holton
Potential land for development 153 - Town Farm 3, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section
Potential land for development 153 - Town Farm 3, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID
474

Comment
I own a part of this land.
I have not been notified of any prospect of potential development of the land.
The land is not suitable for development for the following reasons:-
* It is productive agricultural land.
* It forms part of the Strategic Gap (Policy DM 28 Adopted January 2011) and Open Breaks to prevent coalescence of Halesworth and Holton and maintain the open character of the high land and fields and hedgerows that separate the two settlements.
* There is no access to the land except through the Town Farm chick-rearing farmyard which is closed to vehicles; this in turn is only accessible from Harrison’s Lane - an attractive but narrow country lane with poor connection to the primary road network and unsuited to increased traffic. Loam Pit Lane, the upper part of which borders the east side of the land is an unmade single vehicle width farm track which terminates at Town Farm; the surfaced lore part of Loam Pit Lane is also narrow and congested as it serves several houses on each side and the allotments. Furthermore the junction at Holton Road is very awkward with poor sight lines under the railway bridge and totally unsuited to increased burden of traffic arising from development.
* Development of this land would adversely affect the setting of a Listed Building.
* The steeply rising nature of the land forms an important feature and backdrop to the principal approach to Halesworth down London Road; development of this site would be conspicuous and completely alter and harm the landscape setting of the Town.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section  
Potential land for development 153 - Town Farm 3, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID  
1200

Comment  
The sites further north 106, 140, 141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town. There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
Environment Agency

Section  
Potential land for development 153 - Town Farm 3, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID  
1160

Comment  
We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:
Source Protection Zone 2
*Source Protection Zone* - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).

### Halesworth Town Council N Rees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 153 - Town Farm 3, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The sites adjacent to 161 - 151, 152, 153 should be considered as potentially adding to a sport/ recreational facility.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  
Potential land for development 153 - Town Farm 3, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID  
1100

Comment  
Proximity to Town Farmhouse, grade II listed building to east. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Building.
Louis Baum

Section Potential land for development 153 - Town Farm 3, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID 268

Comment [Saved in Chapel House as Objections to Waveney Development Plan 01 06 16]
Having only by chance come across the Waveney District Council’s information re a consultation process for new developments between Halesworth and Holton, it is most surprising to us that this information was not circulated in Loam Pit Lane, which is surrounded by potential development plots, especially in the upper, northern end. This failure of consultation should on its own invalidate any proposals WDC might consider for development of this land for housing.

Further, considering WDC’s own intentions to keep "strategic gaps" and "prevent coalescence and retain separate identities between Halesworth and Holton", and the assertion that "developments will not be permitted where it would prejudice the aims of maintaining the open character of strategic gaps and open breaks as identified on the proposal map", these locations, in particular 65, seem to be explicitly ruled out for further development. Why, therefore, are they up for discussion?

Even if this were not the case, problems of access and provision of services to these locations make them less desirable areas for development by comparison with other open spaces in the area northwest of Halesworth.

For these reasons we believe that WDC and Halesworth Town Council should explicitly rule out these locations as sites for future housing development.

Liz Calder and Louis Baum
Chapel House
Loam Pit Lane
Halesworth
IP19 8EZ
Paul Cope

Section: Potential land for development 153 - Town Farm 3, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID: 154

Comment: Other sites - 65, 161, 153 etc would build within Halesworth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 153 - Town Farm 3, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 153;155 both abut the proposed redevelopment of the existing sports field Site161 held in trust for the community by Halesworth Playing Fields Association. These sites could be linked to this proposed development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tony Langford

Section: Potential land for development 153 - Town Farm 3, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID: 37

Comment: Assumed that this was already part of the planned Dairy Hill development to improve Cutler’s Hill surgery and replace Patrick Stead facilities and if so, should progress.
Potential land for development 154 - Town Farm 4, Land off Harrisons Lane, Holton

Anonymous

Section Potential land for development 154 - Town Farm 4, Land off Harrisons Lane, Holton

Comment ID 179

Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section | Potential land for development 154 - Town Farm 4, Land off Harrisons Lane, Holton

Comment ID | 522

Comment | This land is not suitable for development for the following reasons:-
* It is productive agricultural land.
* The land is remote from the town centre and residential development would exacerbate car journeys.
* It forms part of the Strategic Gap (Policy 28 Adopted January 2011) and Open Breaks to prevent coalescence of Halesworth and Holton and maintain the character of fields and ancient hedgerows that separate the two settlements.
* the land adjoins or includes the distinctive landscape feature of a 'green lane' or 'loke' with high amenity value and much used and appreciated which should be conserved.
* There is no access to the land except through the Town Farm chick-rearing farmyard which is closed to vehicles; this in turn is only accessible from Harrison's Lane - an attractive but narrow country lane with poor connection to the primary road network and unsuited to increased traffic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 154 - Town Farm 4, Land off Harrisons Lane, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The sites further north 106, 140, 141 &amp; 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town. There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 154 - Town Farm 4, Land off Harrisons Lane, Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 154 is isolated and as it is adjacent to the envisaged sports development perhaps it should be considered as part of that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section
Potential land for development 154 - Town Farm 4, Land off Harrisons Lane, Holton

Comment ID
1101

Comment
Proximity to Town Farmhouse, grade II listed building to west and Hill Farmhouse, grade II listed building to south. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Buildings.
John Lavery

Section  Potential land for development 154 - Town Farm 4, Land off Harrisons Lane, Holton

Comment ID  181

Comment  These comments apply to ALL the Town Farm sites i.e. 151, 152, 153, & 155! Along with site 65 these fields remain the only points of separation of Holton from Halesworth. If the town farm sites are lost to development Holton is effectively absorbed into Greater Halesworth. So, from being a pleasant village partly surrounded by fields, Holton becomes part of Halesworth's nondescript urban sprawl. This isn't desirable for either community.
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 154 - Town Farm 4, Land off Harrisons Lane, Holton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 154 is difficult to access unless part of site 65 has limited development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Langford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 154 - Town Farm 4, Land off Harrisons Lane, Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Should not be considered for development as would impact on the strategic gap between Halesworth &amp; Holton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 155 - Town Farm 5, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section Potential land for development 155 - Town Farm 5, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID 494

Comment This land adjoins my property. I have not received any notification of a proposal for residential development.

The land is unsuitable for residential development for the following reasons:-

* There is no adequate vehicular access. The land is only accessible from Loam Pit Lane which is a narrow un-made single lane farm track closed at Town Farm; the surfaced lower part of the lane is extremely congested (see comment on site 153 above) and totally unsuitable as access to any further development.

* The land forms part of the Strategic Gap (Policy DM28 Adopted January 2011).

* The land is a rare survival of an enclosed paddock bounded by ancient hedgerows and trees (mainly oaks) and is of high landscape and amenity value.

* The land is Set-aside and subsidised for wild-life and conservation.

* This land forms an important backdrop to the peaceful setting and high landscape quality of the Town Cemetery.
Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section  Potential land for development 155 - Town Farm 5, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID  1202

Comment  The sites further north 106,140,141 & 122 are rather remote from the town centre but would provide additional housing capacity without harmful impact on the character of the town. There would thus be no need to develop the Strategic Gap sites 65 and 151 - 155 or the western extension sites 115 and 116. The effect of the additional central area homes would improve the sustainability of the retail core and town centre amenities - and the town would be more compact, complete and animated as a result.
**Environment Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 155 - Town Farm 5, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:  
Source Protection Zone 2  
*Source Protection Zone* - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).  
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section  Potential land for development 155 - Town Farm 5, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID  1102

Comment  Proximity to Town Farmhouse, grade II listed building to north and Hill Farmhouse grade II listed to south. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Buildings.
Louis Baum

Potential land for development 155 - Town Farm 5, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth

Comment ID 267

Comment

[Saved in Chapel House as Objections to Waveney Development Plan 01 06 16]

Having only by chance come across the Waveney District Council's information re a consultation process for new developments between Halesworth and Holton, it is most surprising to us that this information was not circulated in Loam Pit Lane, which is surrounded by potential development plots, especially in the upper, northern end. This failure of consultation should on its own invalidate any proposals WDC might consider for development of this land for housing.

Further, considering WDC's own intentions to keep "strategic gaps" and "prevent coalescence and retain separate identities between Halesworth and Holton", and the assertion that "developments will not be permitted where it would prejudice the aims of maintaining the open character of strategic gaps and open breaks as identified on the proposal map", these locations, in particular 65, seem to be explicitly ruled out for further development. Why, therefore, are they up for discussion?

Even if this were not the case, problems of access and provision of services to these locations make them less desirable areas for development by comparison with other open spaces in the area northwest of Halesworth. For these reasons we believe that WDC and Halesworth Town Council should explicitly rule out these locations as sites for future housing development.

Liz Calder and Louis Baum

Chapel House

Loam Pit Lane

Halesworth

IP19 8EZ
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 155 - Town Farm S, Land off Harrisons Lane, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 153;155 both abut the proposed redevelopment of the existing sports field Site161 held in trust for the community by Halesworth Playing Fields Association. These sites could be linked to this proposed development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential land for development 156 - West of A145 London Road, Beccles

**andy house**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 156 - West of A145 London Road, Beccles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>this seems a natural site for expansion after site 43. housing density is too high as proposed. additional health care and facilities required in beccles to meet this development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Beccles Town Council C Boyne

**Section**  
Potential land for development 156 - West of A145 London Road, Beccles

**Comment ID**  
786

**Comment**

Whilst the council appreciate the need for development in the area over the next twenty years, it must be handled with great care as the infrastructure in Beccles is at breaking point now, especially the Health Centre. With this in mind, it is felt that any housing development should be restricted to the area to the South West on one or two of the sites numbered 24, 43, 108, 145 and 156, as this makes the best use of the existing and planned road infrastructure. However, this area would require a new primary school and a convenience store and other associated infrastructure to service any expansion. In addition, the two small sites in Beccles, numbers 1 and 16 and site number 60 in Worlingham could also be included as sites for development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Natalie Beal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Caroline Topping

Section: Potential land for development 156 - West of A145 London Road, Beccles

Comment ID: 979

Comment: As I said earlier, I am not against Beccles having new affordable homes and bungalows however these need to be built in manageable sizes around the periphery of the town and brown field sites such as plot 16 (24 homes) in the town centre and plots 156 (260 homes), 43 (40 homes), 108 (49 homes) all along a current main road, where there is currently little development and not feeding into the current traffic hot spots which is Ingate Street/Lowestoft Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic England Debbie Mack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment**  | Hello,  
We currently live on London Rd bordering the proposed new developments. This would significantly reduce our quality of peace and privacy. It could well reduce the value of the our property. We are at present taking ?legal action against Essex and Suffolk Water for not informing us of 3 significant TRUNK pipes running through our garden. The source being the proposed site behind us. We have asked in the past if we could buy additional land to extend our garden. We hope we will have first rights if the development goes ahead. This development will significantly effect our lifes.  
Thank you  
James and Helena Harvey |
James Harvey

Section
Potential land for development 156 - West of A145 London Road, Beccles

Comment ID
463

Comment
Hello,
Following on from earlier comments, we hope the proposed Bypass will be built with all the new housing developments. Beccles cannot cope with the traffic now!, Additionally, as council tax payers why weren’t these plans made more public earlier as they directly effect us?
Thank you
James and Helena Harvey
Nicky Elliott

Section  
Potential land for development 156 - West of A145 London Road, Beccles

Comment ID  
470

Comment  
I have misgivings about potential development of this site, along with sites 24, 145 and 43 as there is no limit to development to the south and west of this area. The sites further east are preferable, as they are bounded by the Southern Relief Road to the south, and the A 145 to the west.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul Leman</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mark Beglarian

Section  
Potential land for development 156 - West of A145 London Road, Beccles

Comment ID  
630

Comment  
This site adds nothing to Beccles except to increase traffic and stretch services and facilities which are already under severe pressure.
## Potential land for development 157 - West of Redisham Road, Brampton with Stoven

**Environment Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 157 - West of Redisham Road, Brampton with Stoven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints: Source Protection Zone 3  
*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 157 - West of Redisham Road, Brampton with Stoven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Shingle Hall, grade II listed to south west. Potential impact on setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 157 - West of Redisham Road, Brampton with Stoven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>The suggestion is that this could accommodate up to 90 units. This site is actually in the Brampton area rather than Redisham, but the increase in traffic through Redisham could be considerable and we already have problems. We recommend that this site should only be developed if all the infrastructure considerations are addressed simultaneously. The routes to the local schools for instance (Halesworth Road and Beccles Road) would need significant improvement. Both sites would also present a problem for sewage, as we understand that the present system is at its capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stephen Fuller

Section Potential land for development 157 - West of Redisham Road, Brampton with Stoven

Comment ID 626

Comment I wish to object to the proposed development of 90 homes West of Redisham Road, Redisham (Site No. 157). Redisham is a dispersed settlement where development proposals should be considered very carefully; estate development would totally overwhelm it.

My reasons for objection are:

* Complete lack of local infrastructure
  o No local shop – the closest shop is 2.5 miles away in Westhall. The current proprietor is in his 90's and the shop is likely to close on his retirement.
  o Unsuitable country lanes – there's no pedestrian pavement and several dangerous blind bends on adjoining roads. There were four accidents in Redisham last year, therefore any increase in traffic will increase the risk of more accidents
  o Parts of Redisham Road are single lane and totally unsuitable for our modern 21st Century world of regular internet deliveries via large vans and lorries.
  o Access to the train station by foot is highly dangerous down unlit, narrow, country lanes with no pavements. Onsite parking is extremely limited.
  o No mains gas – new houses would have to use oil heating which is not environmentally friendly.

* Loss of high quality agricultural land and potentially trees. The Government has communicated through various types of media that agricultural land is essential for food production.

* Lack of local employment – the nearest areas of major employment are Norwich & Ipswich

* There are better alternative sites available – priority should be given to "brown field" sites rather than "green field" sites.
### Potential land for development 158 - Wood Cottage, London Road, Brampton with Stoven

**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 158 - Wood Cottage, London Road, Brampton with Stoven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Manor Farmhouse grade II listed to south west. Potential impact upon setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 158 - Wood Cottage, London Road, Brampton with Stoven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 158 is adjacent to Stoven Wood CWS. We therefore consider that this site should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on the CWS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 159 - West of A144 opposite Triple Plea, Halesworth / Spexhall

Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section  
Potential land for development 159 - West of A144 opposite Triple Plea, Halesworth / Spexhall

Comment ID  827

Comment  
Site 159 very small site and adjacent to Spexhall. HTC and Spexhall would need to look at this together.
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section  
Potential land for development 159 - West of A144 opposite Triple Plea, Halesworth / Spexhall

Comment ID  
795

Comment  
This site could be included in small-scale housing in conjunction with any industrial site allocation north of Halesworth
### Potential land for development 160 - Basley Ground, Bramfield Road, Halesworth

**Historic England Debbie Mack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 160 - Basley Ground, Bramfield Road, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to South Lodge, grade II listed. Potential impact on setting of listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust James Meyer

Section Potential land for development 160 - Basley Ground, Bramfield Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 751

Comment Based on aerial photographs, sites 14; 76; 86; and 160 may contain habitats and species of conservation value. We therefore consider that these sites should not be allocated for development unless it can be demonstrated that this would not result in an adverse impact on any existing ecological value that they have.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Halesworth &amp; Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 161 - Dairy Hill, Halesworth

Environment Agency

Section Potential land for development 161 - Dairy Hill, Halesworth

Comment ID 1159

Comment We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:
Source Protection Zone 2
*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Halesworth Town Council N Rees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 161 - Dairy Hill, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to Town Farmhouse, grade II listed building to east. Potential impact upon setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 161 - Dairy Hill, Halesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>This is a site where some sensible thought has already gone in the proposed development. The development of the site for a Medical centre would be a boon in an area that is too far from many medical services, especially given the poor public transport locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Cope</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 161 - Dairy Hill, Halesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Other sites - 65, 161, 153 etc would build within Halesworth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 161 - Dairy Hill, Halesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 161 is the proposed site for Health, Welfare and independent living and should be strongly supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Langford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 161 - Dairy Hill, Halesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>I assumed that this plot and 153 were part of the planned improvement to the health centre and replacement for Patrick Stead Hospital facilities which should go ahead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 162 - South of Wissett Road, Halesworth

Halesworth Town Council N Rees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 162 - South of Wissett Road, Halesworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Site 162 is a very small and would provide few extra houses. Previously used by the guides, the development of this site would have minimum impact of the Wissett Road and complete the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic England Debbie Mack</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 162 - South of Wisett Road, Halesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Close to 15, 16, 17 and 18 Rectory Street, all grade II listed. Potential impact on setting of Listed Buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section Potential land for development 162 - South of Wissett Road, Halesworth

Comment ID 793

Comment This small development would tidy up this site previously used by the Halesworth Guides, with minimum impact on Wissett Road.
Potential land for development 163 - West of Roman Way, Halesworth

Edward Barnaby Milburn

Section Potential land for development 163 - West of Roman Way, Halesworth

Comment ID 531

Comment There appears to be a significant area of land to the west of this site and within the existing town limits. This appears to extend to about ten hectares and could therefore accommodate a significant number of residential units. Residential development here would be inconspicuous and enjoy good access along Chediston Street to the Market Place and town centre.
Halesworth Town Council N Rees

Section  Potential land for development 163 - West of Roman Way, Halesworth

Comment ID  825

Comment  Site 163 is opposite the Church Farm Estate and would complete that area as it is not too big. There is easy access to the town and being on the outskirts of the town, good links to major roads.
The Halesworth & Blyth Valley Partnership Ezra Leverett

Section  
Potential land for development 163 - West of Roman Way, Halesworth

Comment ID  
794

Comment  
This site has good infrastructure along Roman Way, easy access to the Town centre and would seem to be a natural addition to the current, well planned development east of the Town.
Potential land for development 164 - Land west of Northern Spine Road/north of Pleasurewood Farm, Oulton / Corton

Barrington Blythe

Section
Potential land for development 164 - Land west of Northern Spine Road/north of Pleasurewood Farm, Oulton / Corton

Comment ID
1238

Comment
We have only just had the bypass road opened which looks to have been a great success and a relief to traffic and I note that plot 164 development (whatever it is) will surely add significant traffic to the area. I then ask what was the point for he bypass?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brian Jones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CM Woodhouse

Section  
Potential land for development 164 - Land west of Northern Spine Road/north of Pleasurewood Farm, Oulton / Corton

Comment ID  
902

Comment  
I am writing to oppose the proposed plans for future land for housing development in the Blundeston Road area of Corton – sites 4, 164, 165. We have only just been made aware of these plans! I object on environmental grounds and totally oppose more of our valuable farmland being lost. With regard to climate change carbon is stored in soil and not in concrete. This will have a major impact on wildlife. My neighbour has reported seeing 30 different species of birds in his garden. I am also concerned about the danger of flooding as a result of more concrete being laid, especially as we seem to be having more erratic weather patterns and exceptionally heavy rain. Where will all this additional water go? If more houses are built how will the local schools, doctors surgeries cope? We have already lost Oulton surgery and there is a difficulty finding more G.Ps. Surely in Lowestoft there are many empty sites and also couldn’t the Council purchase properties that have been empty and neglected.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section: Potential land for development 164 - Land west of Northern Spine Road/north of Pleasurewood Farm, Oulton / Corton

Comment ID: 1109

Comment: Adjacent to Parkhill Hotel grade II listed building. Potential impact upon setting of Listed building.
LYRA (Lowestoft & Yarmouth Regional Astronomers) Jim Slight

Section: Potential land for development 164 - Land west of Northern Spine Road/north of Pleasurewood Farm, Oulton / Corton

Comment ID: 983

Comment: The agricultural land on the boundary of North Lowestoft (area 164, 165 and 166) should be retained and included in a Green Belt Policy.
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

Section  
Potential land for development 164 - Land west of Northern Spine Road/north of Pleasurewood Farm, Oulton / Corton

Comment ID  
969

Comment  
• Sites not suitable for development:
164 Land West of Northern Spine Road/North of Pleasurewood Farm
We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terry Gooding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK Hannah Lorna Bevins

Section

Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID 1138

Comment

The following sites have been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/HP apparatus:

* 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane
* 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road
* 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road
* 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane

National Grid Gas Distribution would like to take this opportunity to advise prospective land developers and the local authority of the following:

Crossing of assets: Construction traffic should only cross the pipeline at locations agreed with National Grid. To facilitate these crossings protection or diversion may be required; depending on site condition and pipe parameters.

Cable Crossings: For all assets, the contractor/developer will need to consider the clearance and necessary protection measures. The crossing must be perpendicular to the asset. The crossing may require a deed of consent to be agreed prior to work commencing.

Piling: No piling should take place within 15m of gas distribution assets without prior agreement from a National Grid Representative.

Pipeline Safety: National Grid will need to ensure that access to the pipelines is maintained during and after construction.

Our HP/IP pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation to be monitored by a National Grid representative. Ground cover above gas distribution mains should not be reduced or increased. Our MP/LP mains will not be as deep as the pipelines.

A National Grid representative may be required to monitor any excavations or any embankment or dredging works within 3 metres of a HP/IP pipeline or within 10 metres of an Above Ground Installations (AGI). Monitoring of works in relation to MP/LP assets may be required by a National Grid representative.
representative. National Grid steel pipelines are cathodically protected to prevent corrosion to the pipeline. For further information please refer to SSW/22 (see further advice section below).
If you require any further information in relation to the above please contact National Grid's Plant Protection team via the email address at the top of this letter.

Appendices - National Grid Assets
Please find attached in:
* Appendix 1 provides maps of the sites referenced above in relation to the affected National Grid Gas Distribution (Intermediate Pressure /High Pressure) assets outlined above.
(map enclosed)
**Barrington Blythe**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

**Comment ID**  
1239

**Comment**  
These potential developments are encircling Corton village; with regards to the village we already suffer from heavy road congestion and parking problems causing road congestion in The Street. We live in a village by choice wishing to town centre or housing estate living and to avoid heavy traffic etc, in viewing these two development prospects it is difficult to see how Corton village would cope with the additional burden of people and traffic without significant infrastructure and amenities improvements which I am sure will come at a great cost to the taxpayer and destroy a small village community.

This is a rural community and additional Industrial and or housing in the area requires much thought and planning. Given the size of our village and the current road congestion problems I would be opposed to any new development.

Also, I do not understand Councils' attitudes across the country toward the possibility and ease of bulldozing our countryside, rural or greenbelt areas when there are plenty of other options? Instead of ripping up what little countryside we have left why does our council not look at or consider the redevelopment of redundant or derelict sites within our town boundaries? A couple of places for example, the old Boulton and Paul site (I think the last owners were JeldWen), the Sanyo factory site, infact all along the south side of the river in Lowestoft also where the Zephyr Cams factory used to be on the South Lowestoft Industrial Estate. These places have left the town looking very desolate and an absolute eyesore!
**Brian Jones**

**Section**
Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

**Comment ID**
477

**Comment**
Totally object to the development of this site and site numbers 164 and 166 as it is against all the statements from Suffolk and Waveney on all previous planning applications that they must protect the rural Northern approach to Lowestoft. Green belt areas must be protected from over development.
CM Woodhouse

Section Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID 903

Comment I am writing to oppose the proposed plans for future land for housing development in the Blundeston Road area of Corton – sites 4, 164, 165. We have only just been made aware of these plans! I object on environmental grounds and totally oppose more of our valuable farmland being lost. With regard to climate change carbon is stored in soil and not in concrete. This will have a major impact on wildlife. My neighbour has reported seeing 30 different species of birds in his garden. I am also concerned about the danger of flooding as a result of more concrete being laid, especially as we seem to be having more erratic weather patterns and exceptionally heavy rain. Where will all this additional water go? If more houses are built how will the local schools, doctors surgeries cope? We have already lost Oulton surgery and there is a difficulty finding more G.Ps. Surely in Lowestoft there are many empty sites and also couldn’t the Council purchase properties that have been empty and neglected.
Darren McIntyre

Section: Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID: 226

Comment: I feel the council should be considering the land on both sides of the duel carriageway between Lowestoft and Yarmouth there is large clear areas for possible 1000's of houses and you could easily build slip roads on to the duel carriageway Lowestof new road system and hopefully the third crossing so the increase in car use and services well not over load the ageing infrastructure if you added large numbers of houses on to existing estate / developments with in the town.
Thanks for your time in reading my view and hope we can keep our town great in to the future
Gary Shilling

Section  Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID  583

Comment  Another massive unattractive poorly designed estate, should be built away from surrounding villages as it detracts from the appeal of such.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gill Armstrong</th>
<th>Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Access to the area is difficult as the A12 is a very fast, busy stretch of road, so adding another junction would make it extremely dangerous, the surrounding country roads are narrow and already busy. These proposals would more than double the size of the village. Many people live in the area because it is a village with a fairly low crime rate, increasing it massively can only be a bad thing. I agree that some housing is required for local, young people, not second home buyers but even if affordable housing is built, it usually gets sold on to second home owners or landlords, then we are back to square one, needing more housing. How would access, infrastructure, water, power, drainage, etc be dealt with? The water system is already struggling with low power throughout the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section | Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID | 1110

Comment | White House Farm House grade II listed to north east of site. Potential impact upon setting of listed building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The agricultural land on the boundary of North Lowestoft (area 164, 165 and 166) should be retained and included in a Green Belt Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M J Edwards &amp; Partners Chris Edwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Object to this site due to it being well outside the building envelop of Corton village and to far into the strategic gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment  | • Sites not suitable for development:  
          165 Land west of A12 Gt Yarmouth  
          We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure. |
P Mounser

Section Potential land for development 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID 924

Comment It would appear, alarmingly so, that at some time in the not too distant future to make Blundeston into part of Lowestoft and Corton through the huge green field development at Blundeston Rd (165). Villages should remain villages and not become swallowed up into the town, or made a town as has happened to Carlton Colville – some small in-filling areas allowed but not massive green field developments. Where is the employment coming from to sustain the number of houses that could be built.
Potential land for development 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Adam Skinner

Section Potential land for development 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID 225

Comment I feel we already have enough large scale developments in Lowestoft
I'd like to see this land left as it is
Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK Hannah Lorna Bevins

Section  Potential land for development 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID  1137

Comment  The following sites have been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/ HP apparatus:
* 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 165 - Land west of A12 Yarmouth Road
* 72 - Land north of Lowestoft Road, Beccles RUFC Common Lane
* 102 - Land south of Sparrowhawk Road
* 13 - Fairview Farm, Norwich Road
* 30 - Land adjacent to Elms Lane

National Grid Gas Distribution would like to take this opportunity to advise prospective land developers and the local authority of the following:
Crossing of assets: Construction traffic should only cross the pipeline at locations agreed with National Grid. To facilitate these crossings protection or diversion may be required; depending on site condition and pipe parameters.
Cable Crossings: For all assets, the contractor / developer will need to consider the clearance and necessary protection measures. The crossing must be perpendicular to the asset. The crossing may require a deed of consent to be agreed prior to work commencing.
Piling: No piling should take place within 15m of gas distribution assets without prior agreement from a National Grid Representative.
Pipeline Safety: National Grid will need to ensure that access to the pipelines is maintained during and after construction.
Our HP/IP pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation to be monitored by a National Grid representative. Ground cover above gas distribution mains should not be reduced or increased. Our MP/LP mains will not be as deep as the pipelines.
A National Grid representative may be required to monitor any excavations or any embankment or dredging works within 3 metres of a HP/IP pipeline or within 10 metres of an Above Ground Installations (AGI). Monitoring of works in relation to MP/LP assets may be required by a National Grid representative. National Grid steel pipelines are cathodically protected to prevent corrosion to the pipeline. For further information please refer to SSW/22 (see further advice section below).
If you require any further information in relation to the above please contact National Grid’s Plant Protection team via the email address at the top of this letter.

Appendices - National Grid Assets
Please find attached in:
* Appendix 1 provides maps of the sites referenced above in relation to the affected National Grid Gas Distribution (Intermediate Pressure/High Pressure) assets outlined above.
(map enclosed)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barrington Blythe

Potential land for development 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID 1240

Comment

These potential developments are encircling Corton village; with regards to the village we already suffer from heavy road congestion and parking problems causing road congestion in The Street. We live in a village by choice wishing to town centre or housing estate living and to avoid heavy traffic etc, in viewing these two development prospects it is difficult to see how Corton village would cope with the additional burden of people and traffic without significant infrastructure and amenities improvements which I am sure will come at a great cost to the taxpayer and destroy a small village community.

This is a rural community and additional Industrial and or housing in the area requires much thought and planning. Given the size of our village and the current road congestion problems I would be opposed to any new development.

Also, I do not understand Councils' attitudes across the country toward the possibility and ease of bulldozing our countryside, rural or greenbelt areas when there are plenty of other options? Instead of ripping up what little countryside we have left why does our council not look at or consider the redevelopment of redundant or derelict sites within our town boundaries?

A couple of places for example, the old Boulton and Paul site (I think the last owners were JeldWen), the Sanyo factory site, infact all along the south side of the river in Lowestoft also where the Zephyr Cams factory used to be on the South Lowestoft Industrial Estate. These places have left the town looking very desolate and an absolute eyesore!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Brian Jones</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LYRA (Lowestoft & Yarmouth Regional Astronomers) Jim Slight**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The agricultural land on the boundary of North Lowestoft (area 164, 165 and 166) should be retained and included in a Green Belt Policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M J Edwards & Partners Chris Edwards

Section  | Potential land for development 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID | 249

Comment | Object to this site due to its location within the strategic gap between Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth. The proposed 50 hectare site would potentially make Corton village a sprawled out habitat which would have a negative effect on the centre of the village where there are currently shops and business’s. It also takes away a large portion of grade two arable land north of Corton and also effects an established livery yard business situated on Corton Long Lane which in turn gives employment to several people and companies in the Waveney area.
Norman Castleton

Section  
Potential land for development 166 - Land east of A12 Yarmouth Road, Corton

Comment ID  133

Comment  
I would not like to see land developed north of the existing developments at Gunton & Corton. It would tend to become like ribbon development and would close the essential gap between Lowestoft & Gorleston.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Anna Moyse

Comment ID 552

Comment
I do not feel that site 167 is suitable for the proposed 138 houses. I feel there are numerous reasons for this. 138 houses would almost double the size of the village of Lound. I do not feel it would be in keeping with the village as it is, Lound is a lovely small picturesque village that people like to come and visit and walk around.

The existing infrastructure would certainly not cope. The drains/sewerage would not be able to cope as it struggles as it is at present. There are many areas that flood when there is a heavy downpour of rain. This problem would be made so much worse if this proposal went ahead. The roads around the site are busy and narrow, more homes would make it even more hazardous. 138 houses means a lot more than 138 cars. New roads would have to be built in order to reach the site as I believe the only access at present is through the farm. The school in the village has been closed so where would the families send their children? Also there are no street lights in the village, surely a new development would include street lighting, leading to light pollution.

This site is directly behind my home. We have already had subsidence caused by trees belonging to Suffolk County Council which were not maintained by them. 138 houses would cause so many problems as I believe the area is very heavy clay. The ground is damp and boggy on a lot of this site. It also has a public footpath running through it which I believe to be part of the Waveney Way Walk. This walk is used by many people all year round. There is also a lot of wildlife on this site, every morning and evening I see the Barn Owls hunting for their food.

On a more selfish note we bought our property due to the wonderful location, the peace and quiet and the unspoilt nature of the area many years ago. We look out onto a farm at present, I would not be wanting to look out of my windows onto a housing development or sitting in my garden being overlooked by houses! I understand that development might be needed in the area but I for one feel that it needs to be 'Infill' development and certainly needs to be in keeping with the village as it is, it needs to be done sympathetically and not on the scale proposed.
Audrey Grapes

Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID: 876

Comment:
I first moved to Lound in 1988, attracted by its idyllic appearance – country pub, post office, village shop.
Over time the street in Lound has become a short-cut for traffic from A143 – Bradwell / Gorleston to Oulton Broad / Lowestoft, and because of the winding nature of the road, difficult to negotiate. In spite of 30 mph limit drivers constantly exceed this – often on mobile phones!
Lots of the existing properties are terraced and obviously do not have car spaces. Both the shop and Post Office are gone. The re-opened public house has generated more traffic, weekends as many as 12 cars parked alongside the pond, nose-to-tail, and in front of my property.
To introduce more houses, more cars with no amenities, bad drainage, access – particularly from proposed site 75 – seem most inappropriate.
Changes in climate has seen Jay Lane / Church Lane, Lound Main Street and Blacksmith’s Loke regularly turned into virtual rivers in the last two weeks alone. Drains have been overwhelmed.
I hope that instead of just looking at plans on paper in offices, your committee will hold more site meetings to fully investigate the fors and against such plans that you have before you, not just 'rubber stamp' them through.
Bear in mind: lack of schools / no doctors surgery, no amenities, minimal public transport, lack of adequate drainage.
Barbara James

Section  Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID  872

Comment  This area is owned by Suffolk County Council and should not put good agricultural land up for building. The infrastructure needed e.g. sewage, power and water is a major concern. There is no mains gas in Lound village. The burial grounds around St. John the Baptist Church will become insufficient in the future.
Brian and Patricia Mitchell

Section  | Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound
Comment ID | 366

Comment  | The good things about living in Lound is the peace and tranquillity of an unspoilt Suffolk village, there are very few of these quaint little villages left, this is the reason we choose to retire here 16 years ago its outrageous to even think our little village could take 213 houses with the sewerage system and extra traffic, we have no facilities the school has been shut and also our post office / shop.
Bruce James

Section Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 937

Comment I have enjoyed life at Lound for many years. I consider this area as my heritage and find worrying the proposals here by the New Waveney Local Plan.

At present the village area has about 70-80 dwellings on 9 acres of land. The proposed site 167 would use a further 17 acres of "prime agricultural" land to provide a further 138 dwellings.

Such a large development would effectively triple the amount we have now and I fear would prove the present infrastructure unable to cope.

Jay Lane and Church Lane, the main route into our village, are in a disgusting state of repair with pothole and flooding problems and should not be subjected to further traffic without substantial repairs.

Lound sewage struggles to pump 1 1/4 miles from Back Lane to Hopton on Sea thus burdening their capacity in Norfolk.

Until now Lound has managed to remain a neatly compact village but if such a large development is allowed, sprawling eastward into open countryside the village's present charm and character would be lost forever.

The large site 167 extends onto low damp ground and thus is not ideal for building. There are drainage ditches along its northern and western sides which are essentially maintained to prevent the even lower Blacksmith's Loke area from storm flood.

The smaller proposed site 75 is also low wet ground. I can remember a pond there next to the road, development here would likely create further drainage problems.

My steadfast belief is that prime agricultural land should be preserved to feed an ever increasing population whilst the poorer and brownfield used for housing.

I say both proposed sites 75 and 167 are therefore unsuitable for housing development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harry Jarvis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hilary Baker

Section: Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID: 402

Comment: This site is totally unsuitable for a housing development of the size suggested. Another 138 houses would almost double the size of Lound, and completely change the character of the village. There are no jobs or schools in the village, so there would be a big increase in car journeys. Church Lane is narrow, and could not take the extra traffic, so new access roads would be needed. The site is currently open agricultural land which is a major contribution to the attractive landscape around the village. A well used footpath (part of The Waveney Way) crosses this site. New infrastructure such as roads and drainage would be needed before a housing development of this size could be contemplated.
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 1112

Comment Adjacent to Grade II* Church of St John and proximity to Mardle House grade II listed building. Potential impact upon setting of high grade Listed building and other listed building.
Jacob Kent

Section  Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID  383

Comment  Over doubling the size of our village can never be a good idea. The location will only make Jay Lane more dangerous with increased traffic pulling out onto an already busy road. I feel the size of the development will also cause animosity between people on the new estate and existing residents forming old / new Lound rather than one community which we have now. Also that amount of people will make our small village even busier, congestion, parking, public transport are already a problem. Water, schools and the Paget are also concerns that I have.
Jane Harrison

Section  
Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 629

Comment

I cannot believe this site has been put forward for a suggested 138 houses. My main concerns are traffic issues, I am assuming the only road exit possibilities from this site would be via Blacksmiths Loke or onto Church Lane. Neither of these roads would be able to cope with the amount of through traffic generated by the potential of over 200 vehicles from the proposed development.

If the traffic were to exit into the Village, The Street would become a major thoroughfare. It is already a very busy and dangerous road, with car parking on both sides of the road, housing on both sides, a busy cafe and popular pub. Traffic is currently a problem at peak times, I can't imagine how unpleasant it would become with all the potential influx of vehicles.

If the traffic were to exit onto Church Lane, again I can envisage major issues.

Firstly as above the traffic could still potentially pass through the village. Secondly, potentially all traffic would exit very close to the church and Village Hall, at times traffic entering and leaving these areas can be busy, and it is a blind corner as you come round from the Church towards the A12.

Thirdly, Church Lane and Jay Lane already have a tendency to flood on a regular basis as soon as there is any significant rain fall, the building of houses on this land, could increase the level of flooding on the road, as drainage land will be lost, also traffic along this road heading to the A12 would be dramatically increased making it more difficult to negotiate the flooded areas.

Fourthly, the traffic from this site would be directed to the A12, this is a difficult dangerous junction, coming and going to and from Jay Lane, the increase in traffic volume at peak times, would increase the risk of road accidents at this junction.

Other concerns, are lack of school places in the area, overcrowding of the village, village ethos would be lost, potential for extension to churchyard would be lost, and important British wildlife lost from the area.

As a resident in an already busy village, I feel totally opposed to this site being used for housing.
Jennifer Ozinel

Section  Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID  510

Comment  I don't think this site is suitable for development. Lound is a small close-knit community. There is a good community spirit and neighbours rally round when help is needed. People come here for the peace and tranquility and to get away from the noise and bustle of town. I am worried that village life would be lost forever. This site is crossed by a footpath which is used by many people. Walkers come especially to use this footpath from many different areas. The village roads are narrow, and would not cope with the extra traffic from a large housing estate. There are no schools, work, or shops in the village, and the bus service is infrequent, so a development here would mean many additional car journeys, adding to pollution.
Jon Lovelock

Section | Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID | 54

Comment | We are currently in the process of buying a property in Lound and are actually having second thoughts regarding carrying on with this due to the plans to build all these houses. We are buying in this village because it is just that, a small village. With these houses it will be doubling the size of Lound. We also would like to keep the natural beauty of the area for walks and bird watching, this amount of houses will have a drastic effect on this. Also the area would not have the amenities to withstand that many houses, there is no school or even a shop. The road network is not able to cope with this and also the volume of cars that will come with these houses will mean that the roads will become more dangerous as there are hardly any footpaths in the town. With the pub reopening it has reduced the street to single cars being able to get through. Blundeston is becoming over populated and sooner rather than later the two villages will become one and the small, quaint village life will be lost forever.
Judith Hobbs

Section | Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID | 76

Comment | Any development must be proportionate. 138 houses would more than double the size of this village, which would be swamped by it. Lound’s ‘small village’ character would be changed for ever.

Lound is a 'green lung'/buffer between ever encroaching growth of Bradwell & Blundeston. It is a quiet, sleepy place with open skies, open space and wide vistas. Many visitors come to walk cycle & ride horses round its lanes and fields, and benefit from the peacefulness relaxation & leisure it affords. Lound is still small enough to be a community where people know & look out for each other. Lound would lose all this if a large development were imposed upon it. There is nothing here to sustain a big increase in residents; everything is a car-drive away; there is only a minimal bus service. We like it that way, and we certainly would not want street-lighting.

Moreover, this is a greenfield site & a serious wildlife habitat, with barn- & tawny owls, skylarks nesting, bats, weasels, voles, butterflies, moths and much else. It is crossed by a public footpath which is part of the Weaver’s Way. Priority must be given to brownfield sites before any greenfield land is ruined.

A large development would require major new infrastructure, especially drainage, both surface water and sewerage. There have been recurrent problems with both for years. Sewerage often backs up in at the western end of the site and has to be pumped out. Also the western end is within the catchment of The Mardle (the village pond), is boggy and often under water. The adjacent land to the west (The Green) was built on in the early 1990s; this was previously marshy and acted as a mini flood plain for The Mardle. Now the water cannot escape and property at the western end Blacksmith's Loke is regularly flooded. The 'locals', who actually knew what they were talking about, warned the planning authority at the time that this would happen, but nobody would listen. If this field is built on the problems will only get worse.

Finally the issue of safety; 138 new houses means a couple of hundred additional cars, plus delivery vans and other vehicles having to negotiate narrow lanes, mostly without footpaths. There is already a problem of speeding through the village, & the added dangers, traffic noise and pollution would be simply unacceptable. Further, Church Lane/ Jay Lane,
which is narrow, poorly surfaced & prone to flooding, & the junction with the A12, already dangerous because of poor sight lines, short slip lanes and atrocious road surface, simply could not cope with the additional traffic - accidents waiting to happen.

An additional point

The churchyard is almost full and may soon have to be closed to burials. Local people clearly wish to be buried here if possible. If the churchyard were closed the Local Authority would have to bear the burden of burials in the public cemeteries. It therefore makes sense that any development proposals should consider the opportunity to allocate land for an extension to the north side of the churchyard, which it abuts.
Kay Ling

Section Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 78

Comment I believe this development of 138 houses is far too big for lound, lound only has 150 houses at the moment, lound is used as a tranquill / away from it all village used by many people outside of the village to hike, walk dogs, birdwatch, horse ride, and visit for the peace and quiet, children can come and feed the ducks on the local village pond and enjoy a safe romp across those fields via the footpath (The waveney Way) without any harm away from traffic. I believe the structure of the village will suffer from more houses being built and lound will lose its elite Ness as a haven for everyone to enjoy.
Section | Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID | 307

Comment | As already mentioned Lound is a small village which is part of the attraction for most who live here. I also suspect this is not the first time that property developers have tried to build in or around the village. I would say the infrastructure of the village would not withstand the development of this kind, we have major flooding on certain roads / land around the village every year without fail. The sewage system seems to also flood at times in Back Lane possibly overloaded? So I suspect this would not be able to sustain further development. The village is surrounded by open countryside and employment mainly comes from agricultural or horticultural sector, so employment I would say will be very limited in this area. So with next to nil opportunities for employment / no schools & facilities, any occupiers of any new homes would need to commute in order to find work etc. This would therefore increase the traffic flow on rural roads and lanes that surround the village by a considerable amount, they are barely adequate at peak times at present. Further to the traffic issues I suspect any development on both sites will cause traffic problems for residents both entering and exiting the village during building so again increased traffic and disruption will be caused which is unacceptable to residents of the village. It's difficult to see what positive effect such development proposals will have on the village. The feeling is that it will destroy rural nature of the village and the surrounding countryside and increased noise pollution and turn the village into an estate. This development will not enhance the village in anyway the only enhancement will be to the developers bank account as they try to squeeze another few rabbit hutches on a plot of land while destroying another English village in the process.
Lily Gosling

Section Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 79

Comment I dont agree that Lound would benefit from more houses being built, this is a small village and should stay so, as a resident of Lound since 1958 I feel the quality of life of the people that live in Lound at this time would suffer. The houses are not needed, but the need for a quiet place to escape to is hard to find and many visitors come to Lound to enjoy the freedom that Lound can extend them. Any expansion would spoil this quiet lovely unspoilt village.
Louis Smith

Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 319

Comment

This potential site is completely inappropriate for development. A development of this size would double the size of Lound, and completely overwhelm the existing community. It would change the character of the village. Surface water drains from West to East across this land, and any development here would disturb this flow and could result in flooding to existing properties in the village. The foul water drainage is already at full capacity, so significant investment in drainage would be required. Church Lane is a narrow lane which would not handle the extra traffic generated by a large new housing estate. Lound has no shops, schools, or employment and a very limited bus service, so new houses would mean many new car journeys. This area is also frequented by bats and barn owls which use the farmland as feeding areas. Finally a development which encircles the churchyard will prevent any future expansion of the churchyard - it is already nearly full.
Lound Parish Council John Burford

Section Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 954

Comment Lound Parish Council had an extraordinary Parish Council meeting on 3rd May to discuss our reaction to the Waveney Local Plan consultation. This was attended by Parish Councillors and 30 members of the public, a very large turnout for our small village.

Everyone at the meeting was horrified by the two potential development sites which were put forward (site numbers 75 and 167), and the number of houses being suggested which would double the size of the village.

A lengthy and fruitful discussion took place where the members of the public freely shared their views. There was wholesale opposition to any large housing development in the village. Everyone agreed that any development in the village should be small in scale and within the existing character and built area of the village. The pertinent points of opposition in relation to the suggested development sites were:

• Inappropriate size
• Change the nature of the village
• The need to preserve nature and the environment
• Take away the possibility of church yard extension
• Owl and Bat habitat, both of which are protected species
• Flooding will occur to existing properties if building takes place on what is 'a flood plain.'
Miles Thomas

Section  Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID  51

Comment  A development of this size and nature would double the size of a very small village changing its nature considerably. There is little infrastructure to support this development as the roads around are small and would not cope with increased traffic. It is also close to a nature reserve, Lound Waterworks, and would impinge on the delicate balance of nature present. It would be better to site this development nearer better infrastructure such as a larger village or town.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moira Cargill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moira Cargill

Section  Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID  890

Comment  We feel that such a large development without giving consideration to the existing size / population of Lound is completely inappropriate, the existing sewerage / drainage system would require huge renovation leading to disruption and chaos for those already living in Lound and the surrounding areas. The population of the village would increase drastically. The roads are already in a poor state of repair and are not and are not wide enough to accommodate extra vehicles daily. Those choosing to live in the relative peace and quiet of a small village and the surrounding areas will find such a large development very difficult to adjust to. The two local primary schools would require to expand to accommodate extra pupils, Blundeston will already have to accommodate families from the prison site development. We are opposed to the development 167.
Moira Selvage

Section  
Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID  
201

Comment  
This unique and picturesque village of Lound with a round tower church and mardle, would not be suitable for a site building 148 houses, or indeed for the plot for 14 houses.
The site by the Village Maid would not only destroy the tranquil beauty of the village, but be a most inappropriate site along the main street with its traffic possibly causing congestion and danger.
The aesthetic value of Lound’s pastoral views and the enjoyment it affords villagers and the many visitors will be an enormous loss. The country walks, appreciation of flora and fauna, doggie walking, horse riding, bird watching will indeed affect the uniqueness of this historic village if building on such a gigantic scale is allowed.
Lound could possibly sustain the building of a house here or there, but THINK AGAIN in 20/30 years time what it might be like with concrete jungle tearing apart a jewel of a village.
Preservation not destruction should be the right route to contemplate.
Mr DJ & Mrs CA Tooke

Section   Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID  386

Comment  The village should remain a village and not double or more in size. The green field sites should remain green field and provide soak aware areas not used for housing. Housing will cause light pollution with street lighting. The amount of traffic during and after building will increase considerable causing an increase in air pollution, there is plenty of traffic already. Wildlife will suffer which includes bats as well as owls, ducks and cuckoos and many other species of birds. The only work in the area is agriculture and existing public house and café. Empty shops and brown field sites should be used for new housing.
A W Baker

Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 371

Comment

This is a lowland area which has been known to flood, especially the Blacksmiths Loke leading to the proposed site. As this is a rural area this makes an idea place for all kinds of wildlife i.e. bats, owls etc. Also it is sometimes used by walkers. Have any thought about entry and exit to the above it would be possible on Blacksmiths Loke it is too narrow as houses are already there. I assume the other entry and exit would be Church Lane which ahs a large amount of traffic and the road system will have to be improved for safety etc. A major point with all these houses there will of course be more children and the schools in the area are already overflowing 'where will they go' due to the growing population new houses have to be built, but not to the proposed scale at Lound, as it is a small village and would be out of proportion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Woods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr and Miss Bower and Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gallop

Section  Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID  116

Comment  This site is wholly inappropriate for development on such a scale. An application on an adajacent site ten years ago plus by another party was rejected for only 3 bungalows (and lost on appeal) quite rightly due to amongst other things surface drainage and increase run off flood risk. Now someone is suggesting 130 or more houses is quite astonishing in an area rich with wildlife, ie deer, barn owl to name but two and on fundamentally the same land and same issues. Tarmac over the fields why not, street lighting everywhere. This is a rural area and should be protected not urban sprawl as Bradwell and Belton or Caister and Ormesby has become. There is totally inadequate infrastructure to support such a huge, by scale, de development which would be a genuine blot on the rural landscape for Lound village. Indeed it would change the whole characteristic of the immediate rural area which is renowned for walkers, horse riders, country pursuits, and quiet enjoyment generally of the residents and visitors alike. It would certainly risk to blight the value of some of the existing properties adjacent to the site in addition. Traffic "rat running" has already increased significantly with the consequential damage to verges, rubbish dumping etc thanks to navigation systems etc. The increase in internal local traffic alone would simply become intollerable and destroy the community as we know and love - no more a quiet visit to enjoy the ducks on the mardle that families and children love to see.

This isn't Blundeston, Bradwell or Corton. There are no immediate local jobs or prospects of same or schools to cater for such numbers. It will just create more local traffic on inadequate rural roads not intended or fit for the purpose. Throwing up blocks of housing on any old bit of land that shows up is not a solution to a wider housing issue generally spoiling the enjoyment of the many for a very few.
Mr R Lubbock & Mrs J Cockram

Section Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 388

Comment We like the village as it is. It is quiet and friendly and a great place to live. We have enough idiots who drive through at well above 30 and we also have enough residents that need to park on the road making speeding cars cause a problem for people.
To build the proposed amount on both sites will only increase this problem as the infrastructure will not be able to support another 200 plus regular vehicles. We will lose the fragile tranquility we have at present. We agree housing is needed, but this amount will cause problems on our very country roads.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms Francis Harvey and Mr Paul Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Yardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment** | * Any development which affects the medieval setting of this much admired church should be opposed.  
* Further traffic and access roads at this area of Church Lane would be very detrimental to all road users.  
* Additional traffic in Lound Street should be avoided. |
David Holmes

Section: Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID: 391

Comment:

My property is adjoining this site, I am against this development for the following reason:
1. It is far too large and would completely transform the village.
2. It is a rural site and has poor transport and road links which regularly flood.
3. There is already a lack of local jobs and high unemployment.
4. There are a number of brownfield sites locally in Lowestoft which are undeveloped.
5. When we approached WDC and SCC for planning permission for an extension we were refused as you stated that this would not fit in with the rural aspect of the area, that the area was unsustainable for development and that access to Church Lane would not be granted as it would increase the risk to traffic. This development is much larger but seems to fly in the face of previous advice and policy.

I am not against sympathetic and small scale development but this has been previously rejected by WDC and feel this is a massive development compared to the size of the village and completely against previous policy.

David & Alison Holmes
Briar House, Church Lane, Lound, Lowestoft NR325LL
**Paul & Christine Colby**

**Section**  
Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

**Comment ID**  
355

**Comment**  
Lound has been our home for many years, one of the main reasons we chose to and love living here is because it is unspoilt by modern development and has a close-knit, friendly community, all of which will be destroyed by this proposed mass development. For this reason and more besides, we strongly object to this proposed development. This would bring between 300/500 extra people to our village, the roads and local amenities would not be capable of coping with this!
Rita Flatt

Section Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 121

Comment The larger area has only just come into the picture I believe, and has been submitted by the owners, Suffolk County Council.
This is a green area.
This has a well-used footpath running across it, part of the much publicised Waveney Way.
This is a haven for wildlife, as it remains pasture from year to year, and a great pleasure to see the owls tracking back and forth for food.
This would be a visual disaster for Blacksmith’s Loke dwellers.
Some 120 houses would just about match the existing number of houses in the village (excluding the larger, out of village dwellings).
Is this to divert our attention from possible plans to be put forward for new use of the old Lothingland School?
The four villages nudging the Norfolk County border i.e. Ashby, Herringfleet, Somerleyton, Lound should, in my opinion, remain as unspoilt villages without any large developments. They are visually attractive and should remain so, for present and future generations, not only for the dwellers themselves but for those who travel to visit the area for recreation. If they were to be developed where would the facilities needed (doctor, shop, transport come from? And that’s without the consideration of the basic needs of electricity, water sewerage). Is putting new housing in a country area, knowing that any transport for jobs/shopping would have to be by car, causing extra vehicular chaos and pollution a way forward for the future?
Robert Moyse

Section  | Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID  | 549

Comment  | I feel that if this planned development went ahead it would totally destroy what is and hopefully always will remain a very quaint and picturesque village. The above named site is directly behind my property and if the proposed houses were to be built it would destroy everything that I have enjoyed since moving to the village, the views I have from my Windows would be gone and replaced with a concrete jungle! the wild life that I like to watch would be gone! the peace and quite of being in a rural location would be gone!

The roads around the village could not cope with the extra traffic this would create, the drainage is very poor in village and adding more property's would only enhance this issue. There are already issues with localised flooding after heavy down poors, so if this proposed site goes ahead this would only get worse as there would be nowhere for the additional water to go if all these houses, driveways and roads where built.
Section | Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID | 65

Comment | we wish to complain about the proposed application 1 the road and infrastructure will not take any more use 2 we are constantly flooded 3 the traffic system will not cope 3 the wildlife habitats and feeding areas will be destroyed 4 the peaceful village will be destroyed 5 the access to the site will create further hazards on the roads we feel that any more housing must be on a minor scale any building on the proposed site these houses will be higher than most especially in blacksmiths loke this would mean more flooding and sewage problems the site has a footpath that runs through it the water pressure is low and the supply is not very good at times there is no parking only on the roads there is no street lighting there is no school in the area no shop only a pub and a café we feel that a development of this size will only destroy this area Mr G Smith nr325ls
Susan Burden

Section Potential land for development 167 - Land north of Church Lane, Lound

Comment ID 917

Comment I do not think the plans to put 138 houses on the site at the end of Blacksmith’s Loke is a very good idea. The infrastructure of the village could not sustain it. We on this part of Blacksmiths Loke are on soakaway sewage the pipe of which is under this field so it would mean a complete reconstruction of the sewage system. The village itself has no shops, no school. Very limited transport. The only entrance to this field is down Blacksmith Loke which is an unadopted Bridal Way and there is a public footpath across the field itself and is all part of the Waveney Way. There is no drainage system in Blacksmiths Loke and it floods badly after any rain. So concreting over the field would make this situation even worse. As the water would all run down the Loke as happened after housing was built on the land opposite the Village Maid. The water all runs down here now as it has nowhere else to go.
Potential land for development 168 - Land south of Union Lane, Oulton

Environment Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 168 - Land south of Union Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source Protection Zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic England Debbie Mack

Section Potential land for development 168 - Land south of Union Lane, Oulton

Comment ID 1113

Comment Proximity to Blue Boar Inn, grade II to the east and the Manor House grade II * listed to the south east. Potential impact upon the setting of high grade and other listed buildings.
**Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 168 - Land south of Union Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | • Sites not suitable for development:  
168 Land South of Union Lane  
We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure. |
**Potential land for development 169 - Land south of Union Lane and west of Red House Close, Oulton**

**Environment Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 169 - Land south of Union Lane and west of Red House Close, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source Protection Zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gary Shilling

Section  
Potential land for development 169 - Land south of Union Lane and west of Red House Close, Oulton

Comment ID  
585

Comment  
Not suitable as village infrastructure not capable of sustain a development of this size, i.e drainage (already an unsolved problem), roads (too narrow and un paved for pedestrians), Lowestoft swallowing up surrounding villages again.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 169 - Land south of Union Lane and west of Red House Close, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity to Blue Boar Inn, grade II to the east and the Manor House grade II * listed to the south east. Potential impact upon the setting of high grade and other listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 169 - Land south of Union Lane and west of Red House Close, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | • Sites not suitable for development:  
169 Land South of Union Lane and West of Red House Close  
We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure. |
Potential land for development 170 - Land south west of Union Lane, Oulton

Environment Agency

Section | Potential land for development 170 - Land south west of Union Lane, Oulton

Comment ID | 1150

Comment | We have done a high level review of the proposed sites and identified the following environmental constraints:
Source Protection Zone 3
*Source Protection Zone - These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk. The maps show three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gary Shilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gary Shilling

Section  Potential land for development 170 - Land south west of Union Lane, Oulton

Comment ID  586

Comment  Not suitable as village infrastructure not capable of sustain a development of this size, i.e. drainage (already an unsolved problem), roads (too narrow and un paved for pedestrians), Lowestoft swallowing up surrounding villages again.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 170 - Land south west of Union Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity of ruins of Church of St Andrew grade II to the north west. Potential impact upon the setting of Listed building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 170 - Land south west of Union Lane, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>• Sites not suitable for development:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170 Land South West of Union Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and egress road infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential land for development 171 - Land west of Flixton View, Oulton

Craig Hamilton

Section Potential land for development 171 - Land west of Flixton View, Oulton

Comment ID 339

Comment I have 2 concerns associated with the proposed development. Firstly, for the number of homes being suggested I would have concern about traffic infrastructure either from Union Lane or via Hall Lane due to the significant increase in traffic. Secondly, other than the proposed dwellings adjacent, the dwellings suggested on the farmland towards Flixton, my understanding is that this would be to the detriment as it expands onto existing farmland, and surely using a brownfield site would have a better impact. This of course applies to 169, 170 and 171.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic England Debbie Mack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oulton Parish Council Carolyn Gosling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 171 - Land west of Flixton View, Oulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | • Sites not suitable for development:  
171 Land West of Flixton View  
We do not consider this site suitable for development due to poor access and egress road infrastructure. |
Potential land for development 172 - Land to west of Parkhill (south of Spinney Farm), Flixton (East)

Historic England Debbie Mack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Potential land for development 172 - Land to west of Parkhill (south of Spinney Farm), Flixton (East)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Proximity of The Lodge and The Hall, both grade II listed to the east. Potential impact upon the setting of Listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>